

THE
SATURDAY REVIEW
OF
POLITICS, LITERATURE, SCIENCE, AND ART.

No. 1,348, Vol. 52.

August 27, 1881.

[Registered for
Transmission abroad.]

Price 6d.

THE FRENCH COMMERCIAL TREATY.

IT is hardly worth while to discuss the question whether the French Government had legal power to prolong the Commercial Treaty for three months after the 8th of November. The official assurance that they were prohibited from entertaining the proposal was conclusive as an answer to the English request. It is equally true that Lord GRANVILLE and his colleagues were fully justified in refusing in present circumstances to continue a useless negotiation. It is by its own deliberate act that the French nation has precluded itself from taking the steps which would render a new Commercial Treaty possible. Foreigners have neither the right nor the duty of inquiring how far the disability is irremovable. It is a commonplace rule in international transactions that no State can plead municipal law, which is merely the expression of its own will, as a reason or excuse for dereliction of duty, or, as in the present case, for an error in policy. The fact is that the discretion which is withheld by a recent law from the French Ministers was purposely renounced by themselves when they introduced into the late Assembly the measure relating to commercial treaties. The Cabinet, or M. TIRARD, who seems to have had the exclusive conduct of the business, thought that the hands of the French Government would be strengthened by a compulsory limitation of the time allowed for discussing the treaty. It has hitherto proved impossible to convince French politicians that English traders would in any case allow the existing relations to expire. In arranging bargains, public or private, either party is at a disadvantage if it miscalculates the ultimate resolution of the other. The French Ministers, not themselves disinclined to moderation, were anxious to conciliate the manufacturers and other Protectionists by an increase of the tariff, which, as they fancied, would be deemed in England less objectionable than the alternative of the general scale of duties, which is nearly prohibitive. They therefore invited the Legislature to tie their hands, for the purpose of placing pressure on the English Government.

The consequent refusal to continue the sittings of the Commission appears to have taken M. TIRARD by surprise. The journals which represent the Department of Commerce unanimously profess astonishment at the only decision which would not have been grossly inconsistent with the repeated Parliamentary declarations of the PRIME MINISTER and the PRESIDENT of the BOARD of TRADE. The English Government had from the first announced, as an indispensable condition, that any treaty which might be concluded must be, on the whole, not more unfavourable than the convention which is about to expire. It may be assumed that they had satisfied themselves that no such arrangement could be concluded in the six or seven weeks which are now left for negotiation. The refusal of the French Ministers to extend the time proves that the Commissioners had not even approached to an agreement. Under the authority which had been demanded of the Legislature by M. TIRARD himself, the term might have been extended to the 8th of January, if the negotiations had arrived at such a stage as to give assurance of a final settlement. It was because the French Commissioners were bent on obtaining additional protection, which their colleagues were not authorized to concede, that the prolongation was refused, and that the English Government consequently discontinued the negotiations. One of the official or

semi-official paragraphs contains the curious statement or conjecture that the newly-elected Assembly will be more adverse to Free-trade than its predecessor. There seems to be no sufficient ground for an opinion which is declared for the purpose of urging on the English Government an additional motive for concession. The reactionary party, which is largely reduced in numbers, is generally opposed to sound economic principles, while the Republicans are divided in opinion. The extreme faction, which, in France as elsewhere, is hostile to commercial freedom, has not increased its strength by the result of the late contest. It may be added that at the beginning of a new Parliament members are comparatively independent of their constituents.

Notwithstanding the disappointment which is expressed by the Ministerial press, it is doubtful whether the French Government really desires to conclude a treaty not more irrational than the last. M. TIRARD supposes himself to be an advocate of Free-trade, and some of his colleagues theoretically hold the same opinions; but they know that competitors for office will be ready to take advantage of any unpopularity which the Government might incur by an alleged sacrifice of French interests. They are perhaps also hampered by the clause in the Treaty of Frankfort which secures to Germany the privileges of the most favoured nation. Any concession which might be sold to England would become at the same time a gift to Germany. There is no doubt that such clauses hamper the free action of Governments, though they are commonly, and not without good reason, inserted in treaties. It is useless to stipulate for a moderate duty on the products of the negotiating State, if similar articles may be imported from another country at a lower rate. Low duties on Bordeaux wines would not be acceptable to the grower of the Gironde, if he were undersold by the untaxed importation of the produce of Spain and Portugal. The provisions of the German treaty furnish no valid excuse for a refusal to deal equitably or rationally with England. The favoured nation clause has now operated for ten years in conjunction with the existing English Treaty, which is not more illiberal in its stipulations than any substitute which is likely to be provided. Although the hands of the French Government were not free in 1871, it has really suffered nothing by any facilities which may have been offered to German commerce. One of the evil consequences of the artificial system of commercial treaties is that they foster the prejudices which indeed account for their existence. Mr. COBDEN himself, though his French Treaty did more good than harm, is responsible for some of the delusions which now affect the commercial policy of France. Under the enlightened rule of NAPOLEON III. and M. ROUHER the French obtained compensation for advantages conferred on themselves; they now, under less intelligent rulers, demand an additional price for a continuance of the same benefits.

If the professed desire of the French Government to conclude a treaty is sincere, there is no reason why the negotiations for the purpose should not be instituted at any time which may be deemed convenient. The disabling law which M. TIRARD induced the Legislature to pass only applies to the existing treaty, which will apparently be allowed to expire. A new treaty might be concluded in 1882 as well as in 1881. It is true that the cessation or suspension of trade in the interval would be a serious evil to both countries. The sufferings which

it might inflict on some industrial communities in England might possibly incline them to promote concession, or it might produce a feeling of irritation which would render negotiations difficult. In the meantime there would be an animated demand for retaliation, which would ultimately take the form of a proposed increase of the duties on French wines. There would be much stronger objections to duties on articles produced in England which would necessarily have a protective operation. Only a rudimentary acquaintance with economic principles is required to distinguish between the respective effects of taxes on exotic luxuries and on competitive products. A duty on wine would have no protective tendency, unless, indeed, it indirectly caused an increased consumption of beer. A duty on silk goods, or on French brandy, which competes with English spirits, would, as far as it was levied on imports, contribute to the revenue; but it would at the same time increase the price of English silks or English gin, for the exclusive benefit of the manufacturers. It is for this reason that duties on tea, wine, and tobacco are legitimate as far as they are fiscally expedient. Duties on machinery or on textile fabrics would be largely paid to private persons, who have no claim on the national funds. It would be inexpedient, and indeed impracticable, to tax large classes of French imports, including eggs, poultry, rabbits, fruit, and vegetables. The great mass of Englishmen will never submit to an artificial increase in the cost of provisions.

Mr. GLADSTONE, as long as he directs the financial policy of England, will be loth to discourage the importation of French wines. When he introduced, in 1860, the legislation which was necessary to give effect to the French Treaty, he persuaded himself, with characteristic facility, that, in cheapening claret, he was not only promoting commercial intercourse, but effecting a moral reformation. Not without reason, he thought that light claret would be wholesome in moderation, and that it would seldom be consumed in excess. He even amused the House of Commons by expatiating on the advantage to be derived by maids of all work if they were no longer sent for pots of beer to the public-house round the corner. To some extent his hopes have been justified by the result. An innocent, if not palatable, beverage is largely consumed by the middle classes, though light claret has hitherto scarcely penetrated the haunts of drunkenness. An increase in the price of ordinary wines would be a serious evil, though the additional charge on costly vintages might be almost imperceptible. That Mr. GLADSTONE's enthusiasm for the cause of light claret has not subsided after the experience of twenty years, is proved by his Budget of 1880. He then made considerable changes in the system of taxation for the purpose of facilitating the commercial treaty which he then regarded as a certain result of negotiation. Another reason against a hasty alteration of the duties on French wines is to be found in the complications which might arise in dealing with Spain and Portugal. Any preference which might be granted to either country, though it might procure some relaxation of existing tariffs, would be objectionable if it caused any impediment to the renewal of commercial relations with France. It is well that no hasty fiscal legislation is possible at this time of year. In enacting or abolishing commercial treaties, as in all other important transactions, it is undesirable to be in a hurry. There is nothing to prevent the newly-elected French Assembly from passing any law which may remove the difficulty which was created by M. TIRARD.

THE INDIAN BUDGET.

THE bankruptcy of India is a long time coming. By this time, according to calculations which seemed plausible when they were published, she ought at least to have made a composition with her creditors. As it is, the financial abyss which makes the staple of Mr. HYNDMAN's sermon turns out, now that it is reached, to be not at all a bad sort of place. Surpluses grow there quite naturally, though, like trees on a mountain side when they get to the level of the wind, they are apt to be cut down by unforeseen war expenses. The nation that has no history naturally gives birth to the Secretary of State who has no listeners. If Lord HARTINGTON had had to speak of impending loans, and to hint at Imperial guarantees, the

House of Commons might have been excited even in the third week of August. But to hear of aggregate balances of income over expenditure—even though those balances, and something more, have as a matter of fact been spent—is dull work, and this was really all that Lord HARTINGTON had to give the members whom a sense of duty, or the want of any better way of getting through the evening, kept in their places.

The cost of the Afghan war is at last known. Including the making of the frontier railways, it is 23,412,000*l.* Into the extraordinary miscalculation which eighteen months ago put the expenditure at about half this sum, Lord HARTINGTON did not enter, and, perhaps, it is enough to know that, under the system of keeping the accounts which has since been adopted, it is impossible for such a mistake to recur. If it was to happen at all, it is best that a war should have been the occasion of it. As regards other kinds of expenditure, the actual figures are an important element in determining whether the outlay shall be incurred. But if we had known what the Afghan war would cost us, we should still have gone on with it. The policy of the late Government may have been right or wrong, but as it was not adopted because it was cheap, it would not have been abandoned if it had been known to be dear. The money has been provided from four distinct sources. The ordinary surpluses of the four years, from 1878 to 1881, have provided nine and a half millions; the Famine Insurance Fund has been appropriated to the amount of four millions; four millions and a half were taken from the cash balances; and the Imperial Treasury has contributed five millions. It was reasonable that India should give up her surpluses during the war, and as she will reap the unexhausted benefits of the frontier railways, there is no great hardship in burdening her with the money which has to be borrowed to replace the cash balances. But the Famine Insurance Fund ought not to have been diverted from its proper purpose. Scarcity will not be staved off by the fact that we were fighting the Afghans during the years when we ought to have been making provision to meet it, and the money which the Government of India could not provide without laying hands on funds set apart to meet equally unavoidable demands, might well have been contributed by England. A grant of nine millions, in place of one for five, would have fairly distributed what was, in the fullest sense of the word, a joint liability. For the future the cost of provision against famine is to be included in the estimated expenditure of the year. If any charge for actual famine relief arises during the year, it will be defrayed out of this sum. If there is no call for any such expenditure, the money will be appropriated partly to protective works—that is, works which cannot be expected to yield any direct return in the way of rent or increased revenue, and partly to the reduction of debt. Among the protective works which are first to be undertaken are a canal in the Deccan and a railway in the Punjab. It is to be hoped that, now that works are to be undertaken without reference to immediate money profit, the tanks made under the native rulers of India, which have been allowed to fall into ruin, will have a chance of getting repaired. They are uninteresting, no doubt, to modern engineers, but there is good reason to believe that, if they had been properly kept up, they would have averted, not, indeed, the great historical famines, but some of the recurring local scarcities. It is satisfactory to learn that the agricultural department, which was unfortunately given up a few years back, is to be reconstituted. No doubt, if such a department were to attempt any sudden introduction of European methods of farming, it would do more harm than good. In agricultural matters the Government of India has to learn as well as to teach. It has to study and compare the traditional rules of thumb which are most valued by native cultivators, to discover the scientific laws which underlie them, and to modify the application of these laws by the experience thus gained. Administered in this spirit, the Agricultural Department may be of the greatest possible value to India.

Lord HARTINGTON's observations on the Indian cotton duties will be variously taken as confirming the views of those who think that they ought not to have been meddled with and of those who think that they ought to have been altogether repealed. The advocates of total abolition have, however, the immense advantage over their oppo-

nents that, as the reimposition of the duties which have been taken off is impossible, and the maintenance of those which remain is disadvantageous alike to India and Lancashire, there is but one practical conclusion from Lord HARTINGTON'S reasoning. We have, it seems, ingeniously managed, by one and the same process, to destroy a particular type of native manufacture and to close a number of English mills. A duty which combines these opposite demerits cannot be too soon got rid of. We retain our former doubts as to the propriety of touching these duties at all until the Indian revenue contained no more objectionable item; but there can be no advantage in retaining an impost which has ceased to be important from the financier's point of view, while it has become useless to the native producer, and positively injurious to the native consumer. The latter is forced, if Lord HARTINGTON rightly describes his position, to take from England, not the class of goods which he wants, but the class which the English manufacturer is able, owing to the peculiarities of the tariff, to supply most cheaply. The coarser fabrics are now admitted free of duty; the finer fabrics are still taxed. The result is that, as regards the goods which the native manufacturer was able to supply, he has been driven out of the market; while the duty excludes those finer fabrics which are especially suited to English machinery.

It is so commendable in members of the House of Commons to take an interest in Indian affairs that we are unwilling to speak harshly of Mr. FOWLER'S motion for a Committee of Inquiry into the financial and general administration of India. But a more inappropriate way of showing this interest could hardly have been devised. It is not merely that, as Lord HARTINGTON pointed out, it is not good for the Government of India to be continually burdened with the expense of sending over Indian officials to be examined, while it has at the same time to forego their services during their absence. A worse injury than this is the publicity and importance which the existence of such a Committee gives to the crotchets that grow up like mushrooms in the minds of a certain class of members whenever India is mentioned. A Committee on the financial and general administration of India would bring out men like Sir DAVID WEDDERBURN in their most terrible aspect. The knowledge accumulated in the course of a three months' tour, and the ripe meditation evidenced by an article in a monthly magazine, would alike be at the service of the Committee. The questions which such a member would put to the witnesses would be numbered by tens of thousands; the minority report signed by himself and one kindred spirit—who would, however, dissent from most of his colleague's conclusions—would make a Blue-book of itself. It would be interesting to know for what purpose members of Parliament who are eager to have Select Committees continually inquiring into Indian matters suppose that the Government of India exists. It would be far more reasonable to appoint a Select Committee to inquire into the financial and general administration of England, because the frequent political changes which take place at home make it alike important and difficult to maintain a continuous tradition in the public service. But in India, except as regards a frontier policy, there is such a tradition. Indian affairs are administered, not indeed perfectly, but as well as an unusually capable body of public servants find it possible to administer them. Mr. FOWLER seems to suppose that a Committee consisting of ex-secretaries and under-secretaries might with advantage "go into" all matters connected with India. If the Committee could be entirely drawn from this class no objection need be made to its appointment. Its report could be drafted beforehand, and would certainly be to the effect that, as your Committee are convinced that the questions referred to them are best left in the hands of the skilled and responsible officials actually engaged in the government of India, they have not thought it necessary to call witnesses or to pursue the inquiry further. But a Select Committee would not be exclusively composed of members representing the official view. It would contain a large proportion of members "anxious," as Mr. FOWLER puts it, "to show the people of India that the House of Commons is deeply impressed with a sense of responsibility towards them." If this anxiety were according to knowledge, it would take the form of leaving the people of India to the care of those who are most likely to govern

them well. Being what it is, it would simply prompt those inspired with it to follow the example of Mrs. NICKLEBY, and express a large variety of opinions on a large variety of subjects.

ELECTION AFFAIRS.

THE Irish Land Bill at home and various matters of more or less importance abroad have for some time diverted the eyes of most people from attending to what is really the most interesting of all studies to a practical politician—the progress and tendency of political opinion at home as manifested in the by-elections which occur from time to time. Indeed, from some chance there have been of late, till within the last few days, comparatively few of these elections, which were rather more than usually numerous during the first year of the life of this Parliament. A slight and rather remarkable instance of reviving interest in electioneering matters was afforded by the curious defeat last week of the Government in the matter of the Wigan Commission—"the great constitutional crisis," as a Liberal member, in what for the present dull House of Commons was not a bad joke, described it. As a matter of fact, no doubt, the victory, such as it was, was a cleverly snatched one, resulting from the clannishness of Lancashire, the discontent of the Irish members, and a sudden and skilful whip of the remnant of the forces of the Opposition. But it showed that, if the pressure of other affairs had allowed the Corrupt Practices Bill to come on, it would probably have been the cause of a lively fight, which would not by any means have been a merely party one. It showed, also, that a certain reaction of public feeling has taken place, as might have been expected, from the somewhat inquisitorial proceedings of the various Election Commissions, and from the results of those Commissions as far as they have yet manifested themselves in the trials of the offenders. The signal failure of the Boston prosecutions could only be set down by very shortsighted judges as due to local partisanship. It was almost an inevitable consequence of the revolt which such sense of fairness as is yet left in England makes at the present method of conducting election inquiries. That the Commissioners should choose certain persons to summon, and certain not to summon, and should by this choice ensure immunity from prosecution to the one, and render the others liable to prosecution, is not the sort of thing that commends itself to the possibly obtuse, but frequently generous, judgment of the average Englishman, especially as it generally results in the more hardened and skilful offenders escaping, and the novices and blunderers being caught. Nor is it to be forgotten that popular sentiment has as yet declined to recognize bribery as a crime, though it has ceased to regard it as altogether venial; and that there is a wholesome objection to the manufacturing by law of new crimes, the criminality of which is not generally recognized. The case of Wigan was, no doubt, an exceptional one; but there was something of the rule in it as well as of the exception.

This little comedy, however (in which Sir HENRY JAMES, after being caught out in his law and beaten in the division lobby, may perhaps have failed to recognize the comic part), is by no means the serious election affair of the day. Besides the seat for Tyrone, vacant by Mr. LITTON'S appointment to a Land Commissionership, no less than five seats were vacant in Great Britain at the beginning of the present week—three of them by official promotions and shiftings, two by death. One of these was the constituency of the Elgin Barches, vacant—for the second time within a few weeks—by Mr. ASHER'S promotion to the Scotch Solicitor-Generalship. The second was that for Edinburgh, vacant by the resignation of the Lord Advocate on his appointment as a Lord of Session. The third was Mr. HERBERT GLADSTONE'S seat at Leeds, vacant by reason of his becoming what Lord ROSEBURY rather ominously called "the last Lord of the Treasury." The fourth was the county seat of North Durham, and the fifth the county seat of North Lincolnshire—both vacant by the death of the late members. All these were Liberal seats. The three borough constituencies have already made their choice, or rather have had no choice to make. Mr. HERBERT GLADSTONE, after indulging, under the patronage of a warlike Alderman, who announces that he intends to devote the remainder of his life to the

extermination of the House of Lords, in some of the precocious dogmatism which seems to form his intellectual stock-in-trade, has been returned unopposed. Edinburgh has entrusted itself without a contest to another very young person, who is unknown to public life, but who has a respectable Oxford record, and who did not win his spurs at the last general election against Lord ELCHO. Elgin and its satellites have been constant to Mr. ASHER. For the two county seats a remarkable difficulty seems to have been found in finding Conservative champions. On the eve of the nomination two candidates who may fairly be called strong, Sir GEORGE ELLIOTT and Mr. LOWTHER, presented themselves; but up to that eleventh hour it was not certain whether these also would not be allowed to go by default to the highly respectable candidates who, with a proper absence of self-committal to extreme principles, woo them on the Liberal side.

Had this been so it would have indicated the existence of a very curious state of things. As to the artificially vacated seats, it might be said that the Government, taught by uncomfortable experience in Wigton and Oxford, took care to disturb only those who were quite safe of re-election or of replacement by the right sort of man. The group of small constituencies which was so long represented by Mr. GRANT DUFF is traditionally Liberal, though its most important member—Peterhead—is said to have Tory leanings, which have hitherto awaited development in vain. Edinburgh declared itself in favour of Mr. GLADSTONE (who had virtually wooed it at the same time as its county) by an enormous majority last year. Leeds is perhaps more dubious. It can hardly be supposed that the entire population of a large, wealthy, and not unintelligent town shares its Alderman's bloodthirsty designs on the House of Lords, or that the inhabitants of the cloth capital are one and all beguiled by the honour of sending to Parliament a Prime Minister's youngest son, who has a fine capacity for indiscriminate assertion. Yet the Leeds Conservatives, who once held two of the seats, made no sign, which, as Mr. HERBERT GLADSTONE remarked, with the graceful courtesy which sits so pleasingly on youth, and which he has more than once exhibited, was "prudent" of them. The two county seats are, however, the most instructive. Neither is what may be called a Tory stronghold, but both were held in the last Parliament by Tories, and in both the Tory candidate was beaten last year by majorities of no very decisive character. The abandonment of them, therefore, would have been a sign either of remarkable apathy, or of singularly bad organization, or of some peculiar cause affecting the class from which candidates are drawn. In all of these reasons there is probably some weight. Landowners and great merchants—the only two classes of persons who can, as a rule, afford the expense of a county contest—are just now very badly off. The benumbing effect of the defeat of last year has not yet passed, and in very few cases is the organization of the Conservative party vigorous and complete. But a general reluctance to take the field would not have been of good omen, even if no merely party point of view were taken for considering it. Paradoxical persons have been found to maintain that the advantage of bribery was that it kept up a lively interest in political matters. The badness of the means may have exceeded the goodness of the end, but about the goodness of the end there can be no doubt whatever. A country in which individual interest in politics is replaced by a mere acquiescence in the dictates of caucus leaders is a country in a very bad way. Indeed, one of the very worst things about these new-fangled organizations is that they tend to render politics a mere tournament of Renaissance Italians, in which hard fighting is out of fashion. No human being can, without an extraordinary intellectual conviction, long take an interest in a party which will not fight. In how many persons this sort of intellectual conviction subsists must of course be a matter of doubt; but the number of voters in any particular constituency who can form with intelligence and support with knowledge political opinions of any kind is, and always must be, very small. Some means must therefore be used to keep adherents together, and of those means the most certain is giving battle on every occasion when there is the least hope of success. Nothing has been hitherto more remote from the general temper of English politicians than acquiescence in the domination of a mere prevalent party, no matter what the opinions of that party may be.

Nor can anything be less desirable from any point of view, Tory or Liberal, except from the point of view of those who simply desire to destroy as much as possible during the time of apathy, than that the spell of that apathy should continue. It is in the shock of opposing forces that healthy and vigorous political life consists, not in the continual acting of a tedious and monotonous drama of surrender.

THE POPE AT MALTA.

WHEN the POPE from time to time intimates through his recognized organs that in certain contingencies he may remove his residence from Rome, the menace is probably rather an expression of legitimate indignation than the announcement of a serious purpose. In former times the abandonment of the central seat of Latin Christianity would have alarmed the consciences of great numbers of Catholics in almost all parts of Europe; and even so late as the time when the late Pope commenced his reign, his compulsory exile might have been regarded as a cause of war. Through his own fanatical imprudence, combined with unfavourable circumstances, PIUS IX. contrived successively to alienate every Government which had treated the Holy See with devotion, with good will, or with tolerance. He refused to recognize the kingdom of Italy, he affected to regard the Constitution of Austria as non-existent, and at one time he provoked the great body of Englishmen, who might have treated his pompous proclamations with contempt, into a temporary outburst of violent irritation. The so-called battle of civilization in Germany was provoked, though scarcely justified, by the absurd decrees of the Council of Rome. The POPE might perhaps be excused for resenting the patronizing protection of France; but a statesman would not have publicly designated the Emperor NAPOLEON by the name of PONTIUS PILATE. PIUS IX. could not have perpetuated the temporal power, but his vanity and weakness precipitated its fall. His manlier and more prudent successor cannot repair the mischief which has been done to the Papacy; but he will be well advised in retaining as long as possible his hold on St. Peter's and the Vatican.

While the POPE was still a reigning sovereign, officious Protestant advisers not unfrequently assured him that his influence over the faithful would be increased by resignation of his secular prerogative. Since he has been forced to submit to the result of their condescending counsels, he has found, as more sagacious observers anticipated, that his spiritual authority collapses almost as rapidly as his temporal power. Austria is united in close alliance with the persecuting Government of Berlin; the Subalpine KING, as PIUS IX., with feminine spite, delighted to call him, holds his Court on the left bank of the Tiber. Spain has formally disclaimed any purpose of defending the rights of the Holy See; and in France, which used to be called the eldest born of the Church, the clergy have lost all political power. It would be a suicidal mistake to renounce the security of the treaty or statute which is known as the Law of Guarantees. It is true that the Italian Government has culpably neglected to afford the protection which was due on the occasion of the late funeral procession; but it would be a poor revenge to resign the rights which are acknowledged, though they have been unduly withheld. Within his own palace and its precincts, the POPE is still nominally independent and sovereign. Elsewhere he would be a subject or a resident foreigner, with no claim to rank or pre-eminence except by the courtesy of the local authorities. It is doubtful whether the large revenue which the POPE derives from the contributions of the faithful would be forthcoming if Catholic liberality were required to flow in unaccustomed channels. In the so-called ages of faith the Popes who resided at Avignon, though in their own territory, were regarded with diminished reverence. There is now no possibility of acquiring a Papal appanage on either side of the Alps, and a Pope cannot afford to subside into the rank of a private person.

When the POPE or his partisans threaten a secession from Rome, they for the most part propose that he should establish himself at Malta; and it is easy to understand the reasons by which such a choice of residence might be recommended. The people of Malta are, perhaps, the most unsophisticated of believers in Roman Catholic Christendom.

Their language, which is a dialect of Arabic, secures them against communication with heterodox foreigners, although they are indebted to their present rulers for reducing their speech for the first time into writing. The island swarms with priests and clerics of every degree; and the pious practices which furnish the inhabitants with occupation and amusement might by a hasty observer be easily mistaken for Pagan celebrations. The clergy, who speak Italian as well as Maltese, entertain a peculiar devotion to the Holy See, and they are not unnaturally proud of the privileges to which their Church is entitled under the capitulations by which Malta was annexed to the British Empire. That the Roman Catholic Church is established has never been disputed, and the priests have added to its legal style the further qualification of "dominant." The ecclesiastical buildings and practices of the English heretics are supposed to depend for their existence on a toleration which would not be voluntarily accorded. The English Government and its representatives in the island have generally regarded the zeal of the Roman Catholic priesthood and its adherents with good-humoured indifference. Perhaps it had not been forgotten that, when the Republican French occupied Malta in the place of the Knights of St. JOHN, their profanation of the churches and their insults to religion induced the inhabitants to welcome the English besiegers, who, not without their help, at last compelled the French garrison to surrender. It is not probable that in future any Catholic invader will be able to appeal to the religious sympathies of the Maltese against the rulers who have always respected the susceptibilities of their subjects. Neither France nor Italy can at present easily assume the character of champions of the Church; and the Maltese also, scattered over the coasts of the Levant, prefer English protection to the patronage of any foreign Power.

THE POPE would nevertheless not be a welcome guest. If he were to reside at Malta, the English Governor, though he would still occupy the Grand Master's Palace, would no longer be the highest personage in the island. The Roman Catholic clergy would delight in ostentatious preference of their allegiance to the POPE over their not enthusiastic loyalty to the Crown. The well-meaning population would easily be persuaded to regard as sovereign the spiritual potentate, who would not on his own account advance any territorial pretensions. Some years ago they submitted to a usurpation, which to their simple minds must have seemed far more startling than the subordination of the State to the Church. PIUS IX., with his usual puerility, transferred the Church of Malta from the traditional patronage of St. PAUL to the protection of the VIRGIN under her title of Immaculate; and such was the reverence of the Maltese for the Holy See that they accepted without remonstrance the wanton breach of the most respectable of their historical associations. As long as the Pope and his Court were content with ceremonial claims of precedence their pretensions might be rather troublesome than dangerous; but it is possible that cases might occur in which a conflict of secular and ecclesiastical authority might be seriously inconvenient. The English Government and nation have had no reason to complain of the present POPE, who has on more than one occasion deprecated rebellion and agrarian crime in Ireland; but his protests against revolutionary violence appear to be as impotent where some of the perpetrators are Roman Catholic priests as in the countries where the clergy are the victims. That law, morality, and order are regarded by some members of the Roman hierarchy as trivial in comparison with the supposed interests of the Church has lately been proved by Cardinal MANNING's surprising declaration of sympathy with the organization and objects of the Irish Land League. It could scarcely have been anticipated that a dignified ecclesiastic, by birth and education an English gentleman, would approve the communistic doctrines and the murderous practices of the associated enemies of the English Government. The complicity with the worst demagogues, of turbulent peasant priests, or even of disaffected Irish prelates, may not admit of excuse, but it is easily intelligible. It can only be conjectured that Cardinal MANNING preferred tampering with social and political revolution to the risk of giving offence to the malcontent Irish who form the majority of his flock. Any other conceivable explanation of his conduct would not be less discreditable. The incident illustrates the inconvenience of intimate relations with a Church which

will always regard its own special interests as paramount to all worldly duties. There would be something amusing and gratifying to national vanity in the opportunity of affording a refuge on English territory to a great spiritual potentate who might seem to be rejected by all the communities which nominally acknowledge his supremacy. If the case arises the Government of the day may, perhaps, think that the apparent harshness of a refusal would be more objectionable than the possible inconvenience of welcoming the illustrious exile. Until the proposal is formally made, it will be prudent to discountenance a project which, if it were accomplished, could scarcely fail to cause embarrassment. The POPE still possesses and exercises the right of receiving Ambassadors; and the presence of foreign representatives in a colony which is really a fortress would be both anomalous and troublesome. The duty of Roman Catholic bishops to visit the tombs of the Apostles at limited intervals would, if it were transferred to the temporary residence of St. PAUL, and the permanent home of the successor of St. PETER, overtax the hospitality of the English Government. It would be easy to multiply illustrations of the confusion which might arise from the conversion of a dependency of a Protestant Power into the spiritual metropolis of the Roman Catholic world.

THE FRENCH ELECTIONS.

WITH the single exception of Belleville, where the opposition to M. GAMBETTA proved itself to have more substance than had commonly been attributed to it, the French elections have gone precisely as they were expected to go. A large proportion of the outgoing deputies have been re-elected; the Republican majority is mainly composed of members who intend to give a general support to M. GAMBETTA; and the Conservative minority is reduced to insignificance. The narrow victory which M. GAMBETTA has gained in one circumscription of Belleville, and his relinquishment of a doubtful contest in the second, set at rest the question of his relations with the Extreme Left. If the voting in these exceedingly advanced constituencies had shown that the Paris Radicals retained a secret affection for their former leader, the action of M. CLÉMENTEAU, M. CAMILLE PELLETAN, and the other leaders of the Extreme Left would probably have been modified. It might have been unwise to go on proclaiming war to the knife against a politician who had just been chosen by a large majority to represent men who, in so far as they differ from M. CLÉMENTEAU, do so in carrying their violence to greater lengths. The voting of Sunday put an end to all uncertainty upon this head. It showed the rank and file of the Extreme Left in as open rebellion against M. GAMBETTA as M. CLÉMENTEAU need desire. After what has passed, it seems impossible that a reconciliation should ever be brought about between them. Consequently M. CLÉMENTEAU's course is now plainly marked out for him. He has to supplant M. GAMBETTA, and he will have the support of his party in making the effort. At present, indeed, that support may not count for much, since the Extreme Left is not very much stronger in the new Chamber than it was in the last. But as regards M. GAMBETTA it will be a united party, and amid so much Parliamentary uncertainty union is especially valuable.

It may seem that when so many of the outgoing deputies have been returned, uncertainty is scarcely the word to apply to the action of the new Chamber. To say this, however, is to forget the complaint which M. GAMBETTA has so persistently urged against the Chamber which has just been in a great measure re-elected. In that also there was a Republican majority; the fault he found with it was that it was a majority which did not know its own mind, or appreciate the conditions under which alone it could make its will felt. It was a Republican majority, but not a Ministerial majority. The deputies who composed it were of one mind as to the institutions under which they desired to live, and as to the general direction which they wished the conduct of public affairs to take. But they had no clear idea of what they wished as regards the politicians by whom public affairs were to be conducted. They were alternately satisfied and dissatisfied with their Ministers, and watched their advent and their departure with equal complacency. It may be, of course, that M. GAMBETTA's own attitude has been the

cause of this indifference, and that, if he had been willing to take office, a Ministerial majority might easily have been formed. In that case, however, it is not very clear why he should so steadily have refused not, indeed, to take office, but to assume the Parliamentary position which must in a very short time have placed office within his reach. He would hardly have been so bent upon altering the grouping of the electors had he thought that, even grouped as they are, they could be made to give him the steady support he wants. The fact that only a very small amount of new blood has been introduced by last Sunday's elections is not, therefore, as it ordinarily would be, a reason for confidence as to the policy of the new Chamber. In so far as it is like its predecessor it will have no decided policy at all.

There is ground, however, for believing that many of the former deputies will return with their lesson better learnt than before. The line between the general body of Republicans and the extreme section of the party promises to be even less distinct than it was in the last Chamber. In the first place M. GAMBETTA and M. FERRY have done their best to efface it. M. GAMBETTA has committed himself to that revision of the Constitution which only three months before the election he had openly opposed; while M. FERRY's conversion was even more rapid. It is possible, indeed, that in this sudden change of front M. GAMBETTA had the Extreme Left in view rather than his own followers; and that, now that he has seen how impossible it is to recall the Extreme Left to his side, he will give up the attempt to conciliate them. On the other hand, whatever may have been his immediate intention, the fact remains that the majority of the Republican candidates went to the electors with M. GAMBETTA's new programme in their hands, and that the result has thoroughly justified them in so doing. The majority in the new Chamber has to all appearance been returned to support M. GAMBETTA in getting the Constitution revised, in administering the Concordat in the harshest possible spirit, and in subjecting the magistracy to needless, if not injurious, changes. The long desired division of the Republican party into Liberals and Conservatives, with the consequent dissociation of Conservatism from impracticable monarchical ideals, seems to be further removed than ever. In a Chamber of 557 members there will probably be less than a hundred non-Republicans. The changes in the composition of the majority have all been in one direction. Wherever an outgoing deputy has been rejected in favour of a new candidate, the substitution marks an advance in political opinion. A member of the Advanced Left has in almost every case replaced a member of the Pure Left, except in the few constituencies which have for the first time returned a member of the Extreme Left. It seems probable, therefore, that M. GAMBETTA will find in the new Chamber the homogeneous majority for which he looked in vain in the former Chamber.

This result will be in part due to the past errors of the Conservative party. They have lost no opportunity of damaging the cause they have professedly at heart, or of showing how lightly they value it by the side of their own special crotchets. They have been Legitimists or Imperialists first and Conservatives afterwards, and in a country such as France is to-day to subordinate Conservatism to dynastic considerations is to condemn it to certain impotence. The French people have made up their minds upon the question of institutions. They are Republicans, and they mean to remain Republicans. There is nothing to show, however, that they have yet made up their minds upon the question how the Republic shall be governed. The true policy of the Conservative party would have been to turn this indecision to account. One of the few moderate Republican deputies who has retained his seat—M. RIBOT, the editor of the *Parlement*—says, in his address to the electors, that what France needs is a Government sufficiently strong to resist all coalition of extreme parties, sufficiently master of itself not to run after adventures either at home or abroad, sufficiently bold to take in hand necessary reforms, and sufficiently patient to accomplish them without precipitation and without violence. In the new Chamber M. RIBOT will, perhaps, find a score of deputies who could have put their names to his address without inconsistency. Had the French Conservatives been alive to their own interest these are the doctrines they would have preached. Instead of this they have always been occupied in devising how to fix on the Republic the discredit of every

passionate and unwise measure which has been undertaken or advocated in its name. The organ of the Legitimists professes itself delighted with the result of the elections, because they have put an end to the artifices, the reticences, the subterfuges of those who call themselves Conservatives without at the same time calling themselves Royalists. That the Legitimists will number little more than half the deputies they commanded in the last Chamber seems to the *Union* as nothing by the side of the glorious fact that the Orleanists and the Conservative Republicans will be still fewer. This is not a temper which is likely to endear Conservative principles to a nation which seems at present determined that, whatever else fortune may have in store, it will not have the Count of CHAMBORD to reign over it. A Conservative party within the Republican majority has to be built up without any aid from outside, and, with the indifference to politics which usually characterizes the French peasants, from whom the main support of such a party must come, this is not at all an easy process. There was a time when it seemed possible that M. GAMBETTA himself might head such a party, and show that respect for social institutions was not incompatible with devotion to Republican forms. To expect such a transformation from him now would be to make too large a demand even upon his versatility. One gain, however, may be expected with some confidence to follow from the fact that the very large Republican majority returned last Sunday regard M. GAMBETTA as their leader. He will hardly evade any longer the responsibilities and the sanctions which properly belong to the leadership of Parliamentary parties.

PRISONS AND COLLEGES.

IN the exultation on one side, and the apprehension upon the other, provoked by the final arrival into port of the big Irish ironclad, after its tedious voyage over chopping seas, the foundering of minor barques is, we fear, disregarded, however full of misery the calamity may be to sufferers worthy of a happier fate. A little Bill which passed the House of Lords unanimously under the title, picked up during its progress there, of Contumacious Prisoners' Discharge Bill, deserves a tear. The immediate cause of the measure was the fatuous violence—inconceivable even from that body—of the Church Association which chose not only to hustle into prison, but to sell up, a hard-working pastor, Mr. GREEN, for offences which the Association exists to prove are not among the weightier matters of the law. In 1840 a Mr. THOROGOOD, a martyr to conscience on the point of Church-rates, found his release by an Act of Parliament which allowed the prisoner, after he had suffered for six months in prison, to regain his liberty with the consent of the prosecutor. In their innocence the legislators of that day thought this provision amply sufficient, but the Church Association have now taught us better; so Lord BEAUCHAMP in his Bill proposed to drop that limitation. But then the pertinent question was asked How is Mr. GREEN to be kept from getting into prison again if he shall decline to conform to orders which he believes himself conscientiously compelled to disregard? Lord SELBORNE was equal to the emergency, and cut the knot by throwing the responsibility of future proceedings on the Bishop, with a reasonable confidence in the average discretion of the Episcopate. So the Bill went down to the Commons, and was duly blocked when it got there. At last, however, it came on upon Tuesday, when there was still time to have had it passed during this Session, had not an anti-Church Radical of the clearest grit, by counting out the House, extinguished Mr. GREEN's hopes of freedom for many months to come, except under the almost impossible contingency of a return to sanity on the part of the Church Association. So that body may at least enjoy its Christmas gambols in the consciousness that it has done more to help Ritualism than myriads of Church Unionists could ever effect, while Ritualists have leisure to appreciate the tender mercies in store for them under a *régime* of disestablishment.

For the failure of the other Bill, which was to have substituted the Universities Committee of the Privy Council for the two moribund and unsatisfactory Commissions, the Government have only to thank their own procrastination and want of candour. As the measure passed the House of Lords, that Committee was to step into office as it was—

thus every one imagined—and all the peers, from Lord GRANVILLE to Lord SALISBURY, accepted the Governmental proposal so interpreted without demur. As soon, however, as the measure reached the Commons, Mr. BRYCE, burning to win in the field of politics distinctions as bright as those which he has achieved as scholar and traveller, rebelled against his leaders. Impetuous Radicalism thereby created a difficulty, for the passage of the Bill through the Upper House had been achieved by engagements which no men of honour could forget. However, an arrangement seemed to have been reached by which two more Privy Councillors were to be added, and the names which were whispered appeared to carry with them the promise of fairness, moderation, and an equitable balance of opinion. The Bill was read a second time, and got into Committee; and not till then was it unostentatiously hinted that, under the original Act, there was an unexhausted but practically obsolete power of appointing one more member of that Committee than had been named on its formation. This was startling; but it was a more uncomfortable surprise to learn that a strong suspicion existed that this power was to be exercised so as to destroy that balance on the faith of which the understanding had been reached, while the straightforward expedient of coming out with the third name was avoided. Not only so, but the Government had been so much too clever as to drive the reconsideration of the Bill by the Lords to yesterday, when there was no longer any time for the two Houses to come to an understanding. The result is, no doubt, delay in the work of University reconstruction, but for that delay the Government, and the Government only, is responsible.

REFORM IN VICTORIA.

THERE seems to be an intermission in the experiments which the politicians of Victoria have been for some years trying as to the possible perversities of extreme democracy. In that colony universal suffrage, or the unqualified sovereignty of the poorest classes, has not been able wholly to counteract the advantages of a productive country and a temperate climate; but the constituencies and the demagogues who alternately led and followed them have, to the utmost of their power, fought against the tendency of the natural advantages which they enjoy. In a thinly inhabited territory the most valuable of all commodities is human labour; and the Victoria Legislature has systematically discouraged immigration. Artificial dearth has been as far as possible promoted by the imposition of heavy duties on imports, with the natural result of enabling a neighbouring colony, under a more rational policy, to advance in prosperity more rapidly than Victoria. More plausible excuses may be given for the heavy and exceptional taxation which is employed for the purpose of discouraging the formation or retention of large landed estates; but envy and jealousy had at least as much influence in the agrarian legislation of Victoria as any economic theory. Professor PEARSON, one of the most extreme of the democratic politicians of the colony, has openly avowed the doctrine that wages ought to be raised to, or maintained at, a high level by legislative measures, if the result is not secured by the operation of supply and demand. The dominant working class and its chosen representatives make in Victoria no secret of their intention to pay exclusive regard to their own supposed interests. It is true that in other countries landowners, capitalists, or traders, may have been equally selfish, though they have for the most part been less cynical in their disregard of the welfare of their neighbours; but minorities are held in check by the latent force of the great mass of the community. From the despotism of universal suffrage there is no appeal.

The most conspicuous popular leader in the colony is Mr. GRAHAM BERRY, who has for several years been principal Minister. Few demagogues have succeeded more fully in promoting political discord and in setting classes at variance with one another. He has almost always commanded a majority in the Assembly which is returned by universal suffrage; but many of his schemes have been thwarted by the opposition of the Second Chamber. The Legislative Council of Victoria is returned by the holders of a property qualification; and although there is nothing in the colony which resembles an aristocracy, the representatives of electors possessing a competence

are, as might be expected, more cautious in allowing changes than the more popular body. The collision which Mr. BERRY probably desired to precipitate arose under familiar conditions. All the Constitutions which are copied with more or less alteration from an English model confer on the Lower House the exclusive control of taxation and finance; yet even in the original system the respective privileges of Lords and Commons have never been strictly defined; and it has been contended that the Upper House has the right, as it certainly has the power, to reject a money Bill, though not to amend it. There is less doubt as to the competency of the House of Lords to refuse to pass any legislative measure which may be improperly included in, or, in the technical phrase, tacked to a money Bill. The little rift within the English constitutional lute perceptibly widens in communities where the Second Chamber has neither social weight nor traditional authority. Some years ago the Legislative Council of Victoria rejected a Bill by which the House of Assembly had provided for the payment of its members. Mr. BERRY and his colleagues asserted that the measure was simply a grant of money; and the Council replied that the payment of members involved an important political issue. The contest was continued in many successive Sessions in varying forms, with the redeeming feature that both parties affected to rely on English precedents. A student of English history, such as Professor PEARSON, might have informed his fellow-colonists that the English Constitution would have long since proved impracticable, if contending parties had insisted on their extreme claims; but the popular leaders in Victoria were bent on inflaming rather than on appeasing political differences.

The Governors who represented in the colony the titular supremacy of the Crown were, with one exception, neutral; and it was scarcely of deliberate purpose that Sir GEORGE BOWEN appeared to favour the pretensions of the Assembly; yet neither scrupulous regard to colonial independence nor questionable conformity to the policy of the agitators prevented the attacks on the mother-country in which colonists indulge with certain impunity. Some patriotic orators threatened to put the GOVERNOR by force on board ship, and to deport him from the colony. Rhetorical threats of secession only subsided when it was found that the colony might at its pleasure throw off its allegiance. The tie which unites the centre of the Empire with its dependencies has, since the institution of responsible government in the colonies, become so elastic that it is in little danger of breaking. There is scarcely a greater pleasure in addressing seditious speeches to a Government which never interferes than in blaspheming the gods of EPICUREUS. In neither case is there any avenging thunderbolt to dread. From impotent declamation against remote and conventional authority Mr. BERRY and his friends were obliged to concentrate their power of annoyance on their local antagonists. At one time the Minister refused to pay the salaries of the judges and the principal civil officers on the pretext that the Council had rejected a Budget which was in fact encumbered with a tack. Mr. BERRY also devised various schemes for amending the Constitution which he had entangled in a deadlock; nor was the Legislative Council indisposed to facilitate changes by which it might expect to acquire popular influence. Its proposal that both the franchise of the electors of the Council and the qualification of its members should be reduced was scornfully rejected by the Minister, who desired not only to diminish its authority, but to relieve himself from all constitutional opposition. One of his most audacious demands was that the Council should cease to be elective, and that it should be nominated by the Crown. It was, of course, understood that the Crown meant the Governor, that the Governor meant the Minister, and that the Council would, therefore, be appointed by Mr. BERRY himself. Although he and his partisans often threatened bloodshed as the alternative of compliance with their demands, they probably found that the multitude which applauded their turbulent policy was not prepared to engage in an unnecessary civil war. It is also possible that the unanimous disapproval of the respectable inhabitants of the colony may have exercised an unconscious influence on even the wildest demagogues.

As violence seemed to be undesirable or impracticable, while the Council was not likely to concur in abolishing itself, Mr. BERRY fell back on the paradoxical scheme of inducing the Crown to remodel the Constitution which it

had originally granted. The Council, perhaps for the sake of a trial, sanctioned a vote by which the Assembly made liberal provision for a mission, consisting of Mr. BERRY and Professor PEARSON, to appeal to the Home Government. Sir M. HICKS-BEACH, the Colonial Secretary, judiciously temporized with the deputation, and ultimately declared that the extreme case in which the intervention of the Crown might, perhaps, be allowable had, in his judgment, not yet arisen. The delegates were, therefore, advised to solve the question in the colony by compromise; and it seems that, through a change in political feeling, a settlement of the dispute has at last been accomplished. Mr. BERRY and his faction found on his return that his hold on the Assembly was shaken; and, after a time, his opponent, Mr. SERVICE, succeeded to his office. One of the most obnoxious parts of the scheme which Mr. BERRY had submitted to the Colonial Office was the outlandish device of a popular vote or plebiscite on occasions when the Council and Assembly found it impossible to agree. Even in Victoria the virtual abolition of Parliamentary or representative government appears not to have been generally acceptable; and certain novelties included in a project by which Mr. SERVICE sought to solve the difficulty were also thought objectionable. Mr. BERRY afterwards resumed office; but he has lately been left in a minority; and it is understood that the Council and Assembly will agree on an arrangement involving the reduction of the franchise and qualification. It is not known whether the supremacy of Mr. BERRY's party has been permanently disturbed. The Assembly which he has long ruled consists of members for the most part of humble origin, of imperfect education, and of manners such as those which have recently been obtruded on the notice of the House of Commons. It is possible that such a legislative body may become tired of a once favourite leader, and the fall of Mr. BERRY would be an unmixed advantage to the colony. His successors may perhaps be less ambitious and less active in devising and perpetrating mischief, and it is possible that through the example of New South Wales sounder economic views may gradually supersede the existing delusions. If the Council, in consequence of the proposed change in its constitution, acquires additional power, a wholesome check may be imposed on the caprices and blunders of universal suffrage. The Imperial Government may congratulate itself on the practical independence of a colony which would probably rebel against any external control.

FIRST FRUITS OF THE LAND BILL.

IT was perhaps natural that Sir RICHARD CROSS, speaking to the Lancashire farmers on Wednesday, should decline to say more than he could help, alleging the intolerable amount of talk which he had lately had to submit to, and the satiety of speech which had consequently come upon him. But if the late Home Secretary could find nothing to say about agricultural depression except to congratulate the farmers of the North on the advantages of their position as compared with the farmers of the South, and to pay farmers generally a well-deserved compliment on the stout heart with which they have met the stiff hill of their troubles, others have not been so reticent. Mr. GLADSTONE's guarded, but significant, acknowledgment of the importance of the English land question has been taken as a cue by his supporters in the press, and they have begun to enlarge on the necessity of Land Reform if the farmer is to get over his woes. It is, perhaps, rather amusing to remember how short a time has passed since these same persons were elaborately reassuring halting supporters of the Irish Land Bill by pointing out that the cases of England and Ireland were so different that nothing that was done in the one case could by any possibility be taken as a precedent in regard to the other. The passage of the measure has done away with the necessity of this argument, and it is conveniently forgotten. It is discovered that the cases of England and Ireland are very much alike. The English tenant, like the Irish tenant, complains that he cannot get along, and the obvious way to help him to get along is in some way to cut him a comfortable slice out of his landlord's property rights, if not exactly out of his landlord's property. Indeed, with a fertility of resource which is not altogether common, the very argument that was used most strenuously for the advantage of the Irish tenant is now being used, with a "not" taken

out of it, for the benefit of the English tenant. It was contended that the Irish landlord's rights must be cut down because he does not make the improvements; it is now contended that the English landlord's rights must be cut down because he does. "A farm improved and virtually created by another's capital offers no temptation to a tenant to cultivate it at a loss." It is certainly true that a farm, no matter how it be improved, or virtually created, offers very little temptation to any one to cultivate it at a loss; but the conclusion intended to be drawn, at least logically, from this remarkable premiss, does not appear. Unless, indeed, it be contended, as some people would have liked to contend in the Irish matter, that the higher the rent the tenant has to pay, the greater his grievance, whether the money represents money's worth or whether it does not.

The immediate occasion for these curious specimens of reasoning has apparently been a reported meeting of a considerable number of Aberdeenshire farmers, who have demanded alterations in the Land Laws and the condition of land tenure. It may be observed, and all who know anything of Scotch farming will endorse the observation, that from no class of agriculturists could any such demand come with worse grace. Scotch farmers, and especially farmers in the East of Scotland, have as nearly their own way with other people's property as the residence of any rights of property in the actual owner will allow. Their regulation nineteen years' leases are long enough for them to outlive any ordinary series of bad seasons and to get out of the land every farthing which, with any skill or judgment, they have put into it—a process of recovery, not to say exhaustion, which, unless they are belied, they very rarely fail rigorously to carry out. Their rents are seldom high, for the competition of solvent tenants is not very great, and few landlords are rash enough to hand over their land for so long a term of years to a tenant who is not pretty notoriously solvent. They are freely compensated by law for some damages against which in England the tenant would have little redress unless from the bounty of his landlord. In certain districts, and in consequence of the competition of the banks for custom, the smaller farmers are indeed dangerously far gone in credit, but that has nothing to do with the landlords. Lastly, the old grievance of hypothec has ceased to trouble them. If, therefore, Scotch farmers cannot get on, and demand, as these farmers are said to do, a general revaluation of rents, their demand amounts to neither more nor less than a simple demand for the redistribution of property. It would be exactly as reasonable for them to meet together and demand legislative interference to make the banks reduce their rate of interest. The landlord lends the land to the farmer to cultivate, the bank lends him the capital to cultivate it with, and the interference with the amount charged by both for the accommodation is on exactly the same footing. In the Irish case the fortunate discovery of the joint-proprietorship of the occupier helped the innovators out of this difficulty. But, putting the Highlands aside, even Radical invention may well shrink from attempting a similar find in England or Scotland.

It is, however, rather interesting to consider the attitude of the less extreme English Radicals towards these demands. They have not yet gone so far as to advocate the compulsory lowering of rent. It is from the Land Laws that the farmer may, according to them, be justly relieved. Now this expression—the Land Laws—frequently as it is used, is, for the most part, used without the least self-examination as to its meaning, and the knowledge of that meaning possessed by the speaker. If it were said that there were no Land Laws in England, the statement would doubtless be too sweeping; but it is certain that the legal provisions which even remotely affect the occupier of land are extremely few; and it is equally certain that their effect is grossly exaggerated. The intricacy of titles, the custom of primogeniture, the existence of life-estates, the absence of security to the tenant for his improvements, and the law of distress, pretty nearly sum up the list as it is presented even by the most industrious advocates of reform. Of these the law of distress is admittedly rather a sentimental than a practical grievance, inasmuch as landlords are not in general lunatics, and are exceedingly unlikely, in their own interest, to distract when they can possibly avoid it. Except the reckless demagogues who speak of primogeniture as if there were a law enjoining upon every landowner to leave his land to his eldest son,

no one affects to see in that custom anything but the carrying out by the law, in a case of presumable oversight, what, by an equal presumption, was the owner's intention. Few people are less likely to rejoice in the intricacy of titles than landlords themselves; and, if any one would point out a way to solve the difficulty, which no one has yet done with any success, it is scarcely likely that opposition would come from them. Compensation to the tenant for improvements made judiciously, and with his landlord's consent, is already recognized in exactly the same way as primogeniture or life-tenure is recognized—that is to say, permissively. There is, therefore, nothing left but the actual prohibition of life-tenure; and if any one with an actual knowledge of the subject seriously, and not for a mere political purpose, argues that this would counteract the effects of bad seasons, foreign competition, altered modes of life on the part of all classes, emigration, concentration of the population in towns, exhaustion of the soil, and all the rest of the conditions which make against the farmer, his faculty of persuading himself of what he wishes to believe may be admired at the expense of his reasoning powers. A more singular specimen of the MORISON'S pill remedy has rarely been known even in Radical programmes. It is supposed that, if limited ownership were abolished, owners would sell part of their land in order to improve the rest; it is supposed that in this case the price of land would fall; it is supposed that, if the price of land fell, small and moderately large capitalists would hasten to invest in it, and would not, as in such cases they have invariably done, rackrent their purchases, but would cultivate them themselves. Against every one of these hypotheses cause of the gravest kind can be shown; and yet, if all of them were granted or proved, agricultural prosperity would not necessarily or even probably follow. Yet this is all which the more moderate aspirants after "free land" have to promise to those who listen to them. Considering the amount of interference with property, custom, and society which the programme involves, it could scarcely be more modest in the corresponding advantages which, even on its own showing, it offers. The agitation, the beginnings of which have been so fondly welcomed in certain quarters, will, no doubt, become more enterprising in time; and something not much less remarkable than the discovery of the Irish tenant's property in his holding may, after all, reward ingenuity before long. There are indications that the farmers may after all be left in the lurch by their Radical friends, whose innovations would then be directed to acquiring the support of the more numerous and less intelligent class of labourers.

EGYPT.

THE Report of the Egyptian Daira recently published is full of interesting matter, both as regards the vast estates managed by the Council of the Daira under the control of the Government, and on account of the light thrown by it on the general state and prospects of Egypt. Much space is necessarily taken up with an account of the long series of legal and provincial difficulties which have just been brought to an end by the provisions of the Law of Liquidation and the intervention of the Government. Now, for the first time in its mournful and tangled history, the Daira has a clear start, is freed from embarrassment, and can fairly show the results of the joint management of natives and foreigners. In one way, however, the Daira stands by itself, for it is principally occupied with the production of sugar, and sugar is not an ordinary, nor is it a natural, product of Egypt. The climate is not hot enough for the cane to give its full yield. Still, sugar realizing good prices in the European market may be grown there, and is grown on the Daira lands. The general result if a normal year is taken, and no expenditure is brought into account beyond that which the enterprise, if free from debt and litigation and well managed, ought to have thrown on it, shows incomings and outgoings which balance each other so nearly that a very trifling deficit need not be noticed. In round figures it may be stated that the Daira has an income of 1,200,000*l.*, and that it is worked at a cost of 50 per cent. Out of the 600,000*l.* thus remaining, no less than 230,000*l.* is paid for taxes to the Government, and nothing could show the natural wealth of Egypt in a

more striking way than that cultivators can cultivate to a profit and yet hand over a fifth of the gross produce to the State. The remaining 370,000*l.* suffices to pay 4 per cent. to the bondholders. This is a very small return, but the capital on which interest has to be paid was wildly manipulated by the late Khedive, and is very largely in excess of what was necessary to put the undertaking in working order. Even if the estates of the Daira had to be bought at the greatly advanced prices which land in Egypt now commands, while the sugar factories were established with proper skill and economy, the return on the capital employed would be at least double what it is at present. How much the price of land has recently advanced the Daira has itself lately proved to its great advantage. It has numerous outlying estates which it cannot itself manage properly, and portions of which it is selling off as opportunity offers. It only sells in small lots suited to the occupation of the inhabitants of contiguous villages, and it finds that there are always villagers ready to buy who pay ready money, and never give less than the capital represented by an income of 5 per cent. The villagers, it may be presumed, generally borrow the money they pay; but the vast amount of foreign capital recently poured into Egypt enables them to borrow at a rate sufficiently low to make their venture profitable. The eagerness of the cultivator to make use of all the land he can get hold of, and also the obstacles which he has to encounter, are also shown by the recent history of some of the lands of the Daira in Lower Egypt. These lands, which had long been lying idle, were let to peasants, who were to reclaim them, and were for some years to pay a very low rent. There were numbers who caught eagerly at the offer, and began, with high hopes and much energy, their humble operations. But the Government immediately imposed taxes, before the land had begun to yield any return; and these taxes were so high that the cultivators had to throw up their land in despair. Sooner or later the Government will see that it is thus killing its golden goose, and that it is depriving itself of revenue that would flow in if taxes were imposed with more prudence and moderation. But the habit of taxing blindly, so as to get something out of everybody, whether it can or cannot be paid without ruin to the taxpayer, is so ingrained in Egyptian Governors of all ranks that it will be long before the needs of the Government are supplied in the way most advantageous to those who supply them and to the Government itself.

The Report of Mr. COOKSON, the English Consul at Alexandria, tells the same story for the country at large of the rapidly increasing prosperity of Egypt, and at the same time it shows how this prosperity may have its results diminished by bad seasons, to which Egypt is as liable as countries with a less favourable climate. The sugar-canes on the Daira estates were nipped last year by a frost severe beyond all Egyptian experience. This was a rare calamity; but Egypt is always exposed to the evils attendant on the rise of the Nile being too great or too small. Owing to the unfavourable weather and to a low Nile many of the high lands failed to produce a wheat crop last year, and the total export of wheat was 25 per cent. less than in 1879. The cotton, too, was 16 per cent. less than in the year before, and of inferior quality. But, on the other hand, owing to the easy circumstances of the cultivators and their desire to hold stock, the crop of 1880 came very late to market, and the stock in store was larger than in any previous year. That the peasants should be able to hold their crop and wait for a rise in the market is a more significant proof of their growing comfort than a larger amount to export could have been, as that might have been merely due to the chances of the season. The total value of Egyptian exports amounted to upwards of thirteen millions sterling, falling short by about half a million of the total for 1879. The direction of Egyptian trade is shown by the fact that more than three-fourths of the exports were to England, and more than half of the total imports of Egypt came from England. The imports of 1880 largely exceeded those of 1879, and Egypt was able to pay for the excess, although she had not more, but rather less, to export, partly because the interest payable on the debt to foreigners was considerably reduced, and partly because foreigners provided her with the money that was wanted. The increase of imports was, to a large degree, in coal, iron, and machinery needed for the purposes of agricultural improvement, and the purchases of machinery were mainly

made by the peasants themselves through the agency of the various banking establishments which have rapidly sprang up, and supply so much capital that the competition is now to find borrowers, not lenders. A very considerable increase in the consumption of cotton and woollen goods, supplied, the former almost wholly by England, and the latter principally by Austria, indicates that the population is able to clothe itself better as it gets on in the world. That Austria should be able to eclipse England in providing woollen clothing for Egyptian labourers is deserving of notice; but it is not only in woollen goods that imports from Austria are increasing, the total having doubled itself in four years. From Italy Egypt has taken little more than a fourth of what she has taken from Austria, and the exports to Italy last year were only half what they were for the year before. The trade of France with Egypt, though vastly inferior to that of England, somewhat surpasses that of any other country; and, although the joint protectorate of England and France is justified by political and not by commercial reasons, it is not without importance that the two protecting nations take the lead in the commerce of Egypt.

While in this way the reports both of the Daira and of Mr. COOKSON show that Egypt is growing rich, there is good ground for anticipating that Egypt may grow much richer as time goes on. It is a country in which public money judiciously expended ought to produce large returns. Fertile as Egypt is, there are large tracts which might be made much more fertile, or which now lie waste and might be reclaimed, with an extended system of irrigation. The main estate of the Daira, for example, is traversed by a canal which is at present very imperfect and confers few of the advantages on the cultivators which it was constructed to give them. Like most of the undertakings of the late Khedive it had a magnificent beginning, but was never more than half carried out. If the canal could be properly finished the revenues of the Daira might be largely increased, and unless the canal is finished there is very little probability that good management can do more than keep these revenues at about their present level—sometimes higher in good seasons and sometimes lower in bad seasons. The Government has recently promised that with the first money at its command it will do what is necessary for the canal, and the Government may reasonably expect to have money at its command before long. The revenues now do more than provide for the ordinary administration and for the service of the debt. We are taken into the region of politics if we ask how long this happy state of things is likely to continue. It will be maintained as long as the joint protectorate works, and works well. It will cease, or, at any rate, its course will be arrested, if there is any serious hitch in the working of the protectorate; and this hitch may come either from an interruption of the friendly relations of England and France, or from an attempt on the part of the ruler of Egypt, whoever he may be, to shake off the protectorate. The prosperity of Egypt in one way constitutes a danger to the country. The VICEROY may urge that a thriving and peaceful country does not need the supervision of foreigners, that the days of tutelage are past, and that the Egyptians may fairly claim to be left to manage their own affairs. Such an appeal is not likely to be made at present, and would certainly be discountenanced if it were made; but there are conceivable changes in the politics of Europe which might permit it to be made with some chance of success. If Egypt was left to the Egyptians the country would in all probability go backward as rapidly as it is now going forward.

DECOYING.

THE Select Committee of the Lords appointed, on the motion of Lord DALHOUSIE, to "inquire into the state of the law relative to the protection of young girls from artifices to induce them to lead a corrupt life," has reported that the matters referred to them need a "much fuller and more prolonged consideration" than can be given to them in the present Session. The evidence already taken is abundantly sufficient to show the need there is of amending the law. Upon this point it can hardly be said that any further testimony is wanting. Indeed, before the Committee was appointed it was plain that the practice of "inducing English girls to become

"inmates of Belgian brothels"—Mr. Justice STEPHEN'S plain language seems preferable to the extraordinary circumlocution adopted in the order of reference—cannot be adequately, if at all, dealt with by the law as it stands; and that, as a consequence of this impotence on the part of the law, the practice has, or had until lately, become exceedingly common. Mr. SNAGGE'S Report to the HOME SECRETARY placed the existence and methods of the trade beyond doubt. The proceedings of one KLYBERG, who has been employed in the business for some twelve years past, are there set forth in the most authentic possible form—that of extracts from his correspondence. The letters from which these passages are taken were found by the police in houses of ill-fame at the Hague and at Antwerp. They are just what might be written by an exporter of ornamental goods. In one, he says that the price for "several beauties" whom he "has" to dispose of will be 150 francs per package (*colis*) here, "or 300 at Ostend." In a second he reports the proceedings of a dealer who "arrived at noon, and at six o'clock left again for Ostend with two packages, for which he paid 300 francs." In a third he sketches his plans for the future. Several people have asked him for "packages," and he intends to be his own agent, and to travel constantly. In another he urges his correspondent not to miss the fine opportunity he offers him, for "one does not find such a package every six months." KLYBERG has not been uniformly fortunate, for in 1877 he was convicted at Rotterdam, and sentenced to two years' imprisonment. But in the autumn of 1880 he was at his old trade, for in a letter which came into the hands of the English police, he offers to bring two "packages" to the Hague for 300 florins. He is now supposed to be living in the Netherlands. Several other persons—both men and women—are mentioned by Mr. SNAGGE as engaged in the same traffic. A Frenchman, calling himself COURTNEY, has been accustomed to take over girls from England to various Belgian and Dutch towns. Another man, who signs himself "ALBERT, Coiffeur," and who lives in some street near Leicester Square, writes to the keeper of a brothel in Brussels "in order to enter into business relations" with her to know whether she would wish to be supplied with "English packages." The recent trials at Brussels disclosed similar facts about five dealers. The chief of these, one SELLECAERT, lived in London with a woman who picked up young girls, SELLECAERT'S share in the transaction being confined to taking them to the Continent, placing them in the hands of the keepers of the brothels, and receiving the price for them. Several letters from this woman are given, in one of which she assures her correspondent that she is much more careful to "fulfil the necessary formalities" than KLYBERG was. In some of these cases the girls know generally the purpose for which they are taken abroad; but a large number of girls are induced to go by the promise of some employment—usually as a barmaid or actress. A principal reason for importing girls from England seems to be the ease with which they can be got young. In France, Belgium, and Holland the registration of a woman as a prostitute under twenty-one years of age is forbidden. But as younger girls are found more attractive and more manageable, it is an object with the keepers of brothels to obtain them. Abroad it is apparently not easy to obtain a false certificate of age. But in England a certificate of anybody's age can be obtained for 3s. 7d., and the custom is for the dealer to go to Somerset House, obtain a certificate of some girl's age who is over twenty-one, and then present this to the Belgian police as proof that the girl to be registered is over twenty-one. In theory, of course, the girl can protest at the time of registration. But she is ignorant of the language and of the law, has usually no very strong moral objection to the life she finds that she is intended to lead, and so, half against her will and half with her own consent, finds herself a virtual prisoner in a foreign country. Mr. SNAGGE is of opinion that the existing law is inapplicable to these cases, partly from the difficulty of proving that false pretences have been used to entice the girl away, and partly from the fact that the offence is completed beyond the jurisdiction of the English Courts. Mr. Justice STEPHEN is "by no means sure" that the law, as it stands, provides no punishment for conduct such as KLYBERG'S and SELLECAERT'S. But he thinks that it is so doubtful whether it does so that the matter ought to be dealt with by the Legislature. He makes, however, one suggestion which the adjournment of the

inquiry has made specially valuable. It is that, if legislation on the subject should be impracticable during the present Session, it would be desirable, if possible, to institute a prosecution under the 24 & 25 Vict. c. 100, s. 49, in order that the scope of the existing law may be judicially determined. When there is no probability of the law being altered, it may sometimes be inexpedient to test it to the full, lest it should break down, and give the encouragement which comes from proved impunity. But where the Government is prepared to introduce an amending measure, it is important to know precisely where the existing law is inefficient, and needs strengthening.

There is another matter which is only incidentally dealt with in the evidence here brought together, but which, when the Committee resume the inquiry, will, it is to be hoped, be given a prominent place in the legislation they may recommend. Englishmen are not in a position to throw stones at foreigners. The licensing of prostitution has many evils connected with it; but there is an evil existing, and existing without any practical check, in London which far exceeds anything that can be charged against foreign systems. The evidence of Mr. HOWARD VINCENT, the Director of Criminal Investigations, and of Mr. DUNLAP, the Superintendent of the St. James's Division of the Metropolitan Police, is not pleasant reading for any of us, since we are all in some remote sense responsible for the things described in it; but it deserves the most careful attention. Mr. VINCENT gives it as his opinion that there is no city in Europe where juvenile prostitution—the prostitution, that is, of children of thirteen and the years immediately following—prevails so largely as it does in London. Mr. DUNLAP carries the age a year lower. "I should be quite within the bounds of prudence in saying 'that there is a great deal of juvenile prostitution as young 'as twelve years of age.' We cannot quote the particulars which the Superintendent gives in confirmation of his statement, but they are amply adequate to support it. More than this, Mr. DUNLAP states that the thing is new. He has been thirteen years in the St. James's Division, but the prostitution of these very young children has only come under his notice within the last two years. There is a fashion in vice, and just now it runs in this direction. That cannot be helped; but what can be helped, but is not at present helped, is that the law should offer no impediments to the fashion. The police at present have no power to deal with it. They see children soliciting prostitution in the streets, they know the houses they frequent, they find them there if they have occasion to enter them for any other purpose; but as regards the children themselves they can do nothing. By the side of this shameful evil, the mere unsavoury condition of the streets is a trifling matter; but it does not seem a very creditable state of things that a high police authority should be able to say that 'from three or four o'clock in the afternoon Villiers Street and Charing Cross Station and the Strand 'are openly crowded with prostitutes, who are there 'openly soliciting prostitution in broad daylight'; that, according to a calculation made some time ago, there are at half-an-hour after midnight 'five hundred prostitutes 'between Piccadilly Circus and the bottom of Waterloo 'Place,' and that the police, as the law now stands, are entirely powerless to deal with this nuisance.

THE SESSION.

AS was foretold in the Queen's Speech, the labours of the Session have been more than usually arduous. Parliament met in the beginning of January, and has sat almost into September. It has worked for whole days, it has gone through continuous nights of debate, and a docile majority was always at hand to vote as it was bid. But the Irish Land Act and the measures which made it possible to bring it forward have absorbed the whole attention of the most laborious of Legislatures. All the other measures foreshadowed by the Government at the opening of the Session have been abandoned. A Bill for introducing some scheme of county government into Ireland, even the outlines of which were never revealed; a Bill for giving a permanent shape to the Ballot Act; a Bankruptcy Bill; and a Bill to restrain corrupt practices at elections were promised only to disappoint the hopes of those who have long looked for some fragments of indispensable legislation. This time there has been no jostling of omnibuses in Temple Bar. The road has been kept for a solitary vehicle, which has been retarded by nothing but its own weight and by the friction it inevitably caused. The first complete Session of Mr. Gladstone's second Ministry has been absorbed in the passing of a measure of which neither he nor any of his col-

leagues dreamt when they took office. There were acknowledged to be from twenty to thirty great measures which the Liberal Government had to pass if it was to do justice to itself; but no Irish Land Bill figured in the list. The order of things is not as man proposes, and the whole force of the Ministry and its majority has been concentrated on a measure which at the date of last year's dissolution would have seemed as extraordinary and as uncalled for to the Government as to its opponents. And as the Session has been a Session of one Bill, so it has been a Session of one man. Mr. Gladstone has been everything and done everything. Never in the prime of life and the apparent fulness of his energy has he been so energetic, so copious in resource, so subtle in distinction, so thoroughly master of his subject, so varied in the compass of his rhetoric as in this Session of his old age. His leading opponents, with the generosity which characterizes the higher public life of England, have joined with his followers in expressing their admiration at his devotion to the oppressive duty he had imposed on himself, at his grasp of intricate details, at the inexhaustible ingenuity with which he reconciled his contradictions when he contradicted himself the most. He alone made the Bill, he alone understood it, he alone knew when the drafting of the Bill was right; and, as he was the only critic of the Bill whose criticism was tolerated, he alone could say when the drafting was wrong. He at last became so indispensable that, if he went away to eat a hurried meal, the Bill was at a standstill. As an intellectual feat, as a rhetorical feat, as a feat of Parliamentary direction, the conduct of the Bill by Mr. Gladstone has been as unique as the Session in which the Bill was passed, as the Parliament which passed it, or as its own wonderful self.

Parliament met on January 6th, and the discussion on Ireland, Irish difficulties, and Irish remedies began on the first evening of the Session. It took the House of Commons exactly a quarter of a year to get to the Irish Land Bill, and a little more than a quarter of a year to get through it. Before the great measure of healing could be brought forward, it was necessary to introduce some semblance of government in a country where, as was officially stated in the Queen's Speech, an extended system of terror had paralysed the exercise of private rights and the performance of civil duties, where the ordinary law had failed, and new powers were necessary to protect life, property, and freedom. A Coercion Bill and an Arms Bill were the necessary precursors of a Land Bill, but between the Government and the passing of these Bills there stood the grievous obstacle of Irish obstruction. Exactly a fortnight was consumed in the debate on the Address; and, after the House had closed a wearisome and most unproductive debate on Mr. Parnell's amendment declaring coercion unnecessary, it had to go through the tedious task of discussing and rejecting a wild proposal of which Mr. McCarthy was author, to the effect that the ordinary force at the command of the Executive ought not to be used to carry out the judgments of courts of law. On January 24th Mr. Forster brought in his Coercion Bill; and the next night Mr. Gladstone moved that this Bill and the Arms Bill, which was to follow, should have precedence over all other Bills. It cost the House a continuous sitting of twenty-two hours to carry this motion, although ultimately only 33 members voted against it. The debate on the first reading of the Coercion Bill was virtually a prolongation of the debate on the Address. Mr. Forster had no difficulty in making out his case, as the outrages in the last quarter of the preceding year had been double the number of those in the first three quarters, and the insufficiency of the ordinary law was illustrated during the course of the debate by the acquittal of the traversers in the Dublin prosecution. Lord Hartington denounced with frank vehemence the miscreants who were troubling the peace of Ireland, and Mr. Bright announced that he had been convinced of the necessity of coercion by finding that the Land League had demoralized the people. The Opposition, represented especially by Mr. Gibson, naturally reproached the Government with the tardiness of its resort to extraordinary measures, but warmly supported the measure which the Government had declared to be necessary for the reintroduction of something like law and order. Mr. Parnell, in the early days of the Session, had spoken with a moderation, and even humility, which strangely contrasted with his language outside the House, although he subsequently assumed the curious position, as Sir Stafford Northcote pointed out, of an equal of the Queen, and of pronouncing when, in his opinion, an Irish insurrection ought or ought not to break out. When the final great battle of wanton, senseless, insolent obstruction was fought out, he and his followers showed that they believed that the game was theirs, and that they had only to speak on and on, saying the same wearisome things in the same wearisome way, to paralyse the English Parliament and bring it into deserved contempt. All one night, all the next day, and all the next night, they went on defying the majority, talking merely to win by talking, and determined to beat down, not so much the Ministry as Parliament itself, by sheer insolence and bravado. How long this disgraceful scene might have been protracted it is impossible to say, for it was brought to an abrupt end. Suddenly the Speaker appeared and desired the Irish member who happened to be the obstructionist of the moment to sit down, and, declaring that he would allow no more discussion, put the question of the first reading to the immediate decision of the House. The highest authority of the House had come to its rescue.

The summary blow thus dealt to Irish obstruction was followed

on the same day by the arrest of Davitt, a convict with a ticket-of-leave, who was specially dear to the obstructionists from the peculiar vehemence of his seditious language. On the next evening, accident rather than design relieved the House of all the obstructionists in a body. One of them was declared out of order by the Speaker; the rest, scarcely understanding what was happening, refused to obey his directions, and one and all were suspended from the sitting and forced to leave the House. Advantage was taken of this happy advent of temporary tranquillity to pass a resolution that when a Bill was declared urgent by a majority of three to one in a House of 300 members, on the proposal of a Minister of the Crown, the powers of the House for the regulation of all business connected with the Bill should be in the hands of the Speaker. The second reading of the Coercion Bill occupied only a reasonable amount of time; but when the Bill had been in Committee for upwards of a week, the Speaker saw that, if the debate was to come to an end, he must use the exceptional powers given him by the House; and he instituted a rule which, in the shape it took after the leaders of both parties had been consulted, provided that, on the motion of a Minister of the Crown, supported by a majority of three to one, the House might fix an hour after which all amendments and new clauses in Committee should be voted on without discussion. This new weapon overcame obstruction. The Bill was reported in two more sittings, and in two more the third reading had been taken, and the Bill passed the Commons, which had been continuously occupied with it for more than a month. On March 1st Sir William Harcourt, in the absence of Mr. Forster, brought in the Disarming Bill, for which urgency was asked and obtained, and which, under the operation of the new rule, was got through in the moderately short space of ten days. By this time, however, the middle of March had been reached; it was indispensable that votes in Supply should be taken before the end of the financial year, and Mr. Gladstone proposed that Supply should be declared urgent. Sir Stafford Northcote, in a letter to his constituents, pointed out the danger or inconvenience of the precedent, and Mr. Gladstone's motion for urgency was not supported by the requisite majority. But it was soon apparent that no obstruction, or even delay, was to be feared. The Opposition gave every possible assistance to the Government, and the Irish faction was silent. Mr. Gladstone learned to speak of obstruction as of an evil dream that had passed away. At no subsequent period of the Session was urgency asked for; and when, on one occasion, a discussion arose on the forms of the House, and Lord Hartington expressed an opinion that some day the cloture, in some form, would have to be adopted, he was speaking, not of obstruction—that is, an abuse of the forms of the House—but of defects in the mode in which the House ordinarily conducts its business, which is a totally different thing. Obstruction, after an enormous waste of time, and through the courageous intervention of the Speaker and the ready action of the whole House, except an insignificant fraction, had been overcome. The reform of the procedure of the House, if it can be reformed, is left to the future; and the Government that undertakes the task will have as difficult a problem to solve as the most energetic and resolute of Governments could wish for.

Mr. Gladstone brought in the Land Bill on Thursday, April 7th. With all his mastery of the subject, and his unrivalled power of exposition, he failed to make intelligible to his hearers the details of a complicated and intricate measure. He spoke on the eve of the Easter holidays, and rather more than a fortnight was allowed for Parliament and the country to consider it. But no study sufficed to do more than to reveal the main outlines of the Bill. Its leading provisions dealt with relations of tenants to landlords during the continuance of the tenancy. The tenant was to be allowed to ask that a fair rent should be fixed for successive periods of fifteen years, and to sell at any time his interest in the holding, the landlord having a right of pre-emption and of objecting on specified grounds to the purchaser. If the tenant did not take the initiative, and the landlord raised the rent, the tenant might apply for a judicial rent, accept the result, and be thereby put in the position of having a fixed rent for fifteen years, or he might elect to go, and then either sell his tenancy, and receive in addition a sum imposed on the landlord as a penalty for raising the rent, or claim compensation for disturbance on a scale increased beyond that of the Act of 1870. If the landlord had land in hand or got land into his hands by eviction or purchase, a tenant to whom he might subsequently let was to be called a future tenant, and have the other advantages of the Bill, but not that of applying to have his rent fixed. Subsidiary provisions were introduced for promoting the creation of occupying owners, as well as reclamation and emigration, and the carrying out of the scheme was entrusted to a new Court or Commission. It was obvious that the Bill gave the tenant something undistinguishable from fixity of tenure and something almost approaching to free sale, and gave him in the most positive terms a means of getting a fair rent fixed. As there was to be fixity of tenure at a fair rent, and as what the tenant had to sell was the right of holding at a fair rent, the meaning of a fair rent was the key to the Bill. Here the Bill was hopelessly obscure. So far as the English language can serve as a guide to the language of Parliamentary drafting, the Bill seemed to lay down that a fair rent was to be ascertained by deducting from the amount a solvent tenant would pay, after tenants' improvements had been taken into account, a sum representing what the tenant who was not in any way being disturbed would have got if he had been disturbed.

This seemed monstrous, and yet if the clause defining fair rent did not mean this, what did it mean? During the long debate on the second reading, which began on April 25 and ended on May 19, this question was repeatedly asked by the Opposition, and with especial force and clearness by Mr. Gibson, but was never answered by the Government. Mr. Forster assured the House that the clause did not mean what it seemed to mean, but what it meant he could not or would not say. The division was taken on an amendment proposed by Lord Elcho, which amounted to a vehement general condemnation of the Bill, and the majority for the Bill was exactly double the minority (176) against it. Mr. Parnell and his followers did not vote, and only seven Irish members voted against the Bill, while thirteen Irish Conservatives voted for it. After such a manifestation of Irish as well as English opinion it was evident that an Irish Land Bill had become a political necessity. But the task of getting the Bill through Committee in any reasonable time seemed almost hopeless. Upwards of a thousand amendments were placed on the paper, and although the obstructionists had been taught that obstruction could not be allowed, and the leaders of the Opposition watched and even aided the progress of the Bill with singular moderation and good temper, the Bill could never have got through Committee had it not been for the commanding influence and the perseverance of Mr. Gladstone. He had some special advantages to favour him—the Report of the Richmond Commission in favour of a judicial rent, the support given to the Bill by the Irish Conservatives, the longing of Parliament and the country to have a Land Bill and have done with it, and the happy discovery of an historical fact previously unsuspected, that the Irish tenant had always had the joint ownership of his holding. But great as these advantages were, no one but Mr. Gladstone, with a majority such as his at his back, could have used them as he did.

The Bill was eight weeks in Committee, and some changes of importance were made in it, although its main lines remained unaltered. It was left to the Court to decide on what grounds the landlord might properly object to a purchase of the tenant right, and fair rent was defined as that which a solvent tenant would pay, regard being had to the interests of the landlord and the tenant. The landlord was permitted, but only after a tenant had refused to pay an increased rent, to apply himself to the Court to have a fair rent fixed; the tenant was prevented from letting a site for a public-house without his landlord's consent, and the penalty for an increased rent was struck out. If these changes are to be considered as changes in favour of the landlord, the changes in favour of the tenant were much more considerable. Power was given to the Court to quash leases given since 1870, which have been imposed on the tenant by inequitable pressure. At the end of any existing lease the tenant was to occupy the position, not of a future, but of a present, tenant, and the question of arrears was settled by providing that if both parties agreed, and the tenant had paid the rent for the year last owing, preceding arrears might be liquidated by half being wiped out and the other half being borrowed by the landlord from the Irish Church Fund and repaid in instalments by the tenant. At the very last stage of the Bill the Government accepted a proposal suddenly made by Mr. Parnell that the Court should during the six months following the passing of the Bill have power to stay all proceedings for eviction on the tenant applying for a judicial rent to be fixed. The Government also rejected three amendments made for the protection of the landlord—that of Sir Walter Barttelot providing that the Court should be bound to purchase estates of landlords wishing to sell, according to a fair valuation; that of Mr. Henegave providing that the Bill should not apply to Irish estates managed on the English system; and that of Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice providing that the Bill should not apply to holdings of more than 100*l.* valuation. The last two of these amendments were moved by Liberals, and supported by an important section of the Liberal party, and were rejected by majorities very small in comparison with the majorities ordinarily at the command of the Government. Provisions were inserted for improving the condition of the labourers, who had been originally forgotten by the Government, by permission being given to reserve sites for cottages. The extreme section of the Irish members offered a violent resistance to the scheme for aiding emigration; and, although this resistance was overcome by arrangements being made for sitting all night to dispose of the clause, yet its scope was altered by the omission of all reference to British colonies as the proper field for assisted emigration, and by the condition being imposed that assistance should only be given when a sufficient number of families in a district should be found to desire it; while the possible effect of the scheme was much limited by the smallness of the sum which was to be applied to the proposed object. Little change was made in the provisions for reclamation and purchase by tenants; and Mr. Gladstone was supported by Sir Stafford Northcote in declaring that his duties to the English taxpayer demanded that he should not go further than to advance three-fourths of the purchase-money. The new court, it was decided, should consist of one legal member, with the rank and pay of a Puisne judge, and two lay members, with 3,000*l.* a year, to be appointed for seven years—a wise proposal, made by Mr. Smith, that the question of the continuance of the lay Commissioners in their posts should, after seven years, be decided by a Royal Commission, so as to avoid the necessity of reference to Parliament, being ultimately rejected by Mr. Gladstone on technical grounds after he had seemed willing to accept it. Finally it was announced that the new Commissioners were to be Serjeant

O'Hagan, Mr. Litton, and Mr. Vernon; and although some disappointment was felt and expressed at men of greater eminence not having been chosen, the plea of Mr. Gladstone that he could not get men of greater eminence, and that he had in vain applied to the Irish Attorney-General and to Mr. Shaw, was accepted as unanswerable. Irish opinion seems to have come to the conclusion that the working of the new Bill will be confined to men fair-minded, painstaking, and of presumably adequate ability.

The debate on the second reading in the Lords occupied the nights of August 1 and 2. Lord Salisbury, who rose after Lord Carlingford had offered a summary of the provisions of the Bill, gave the key to the whole discussion by pronouncing the measure as revolutionary, as most unjust to the landlords, and as certain to fail in its anticipated effects, as all messages of peace to Ireland had hitherto failed, but announced that he would recommend that the Bill should be read a second time for two reasons—one, the present state of Ireland, due to the culpable negligence of the Government; and the other, the still worse state that must follow the rejection of the Bill, as the Lords had not the executive Government at their command, and had no means of combating the disorder that would arise. What he recommended was that the Lords should remove the most glaring injustices of the Bill, and leave to the Government the responsibility of the measure thus amended. Succeeding speakers on the Opposition side—among whom Lord Lansdowne, the Duke of Argyll, and Lord Cairns were the most conspicuous—were thus free to bestow the severest criticisms on the Bill, which, from the legitimate view of the defenders of property, it deserved, and also to make the political necessity of passing it, which they recognized as its only justification, an additional charge against the Government. The only speech on the Ministerial side that was at all impressive was that of the Chancellor, and it was impressive because it was personal. He owned that the Bill contradicted many of the opinions he had expressed when the Act of 1870 was under discussion; but he found himself this year in the position of having to do something new, and, after long and anxious reflection, he had come to the conclusion that anything short of what was now proposed would be useless. Every one who heard him knew that Lord Selborne was a scrupulously conscientious man, far above holding office for the mere sake of holding it, and that he reflected long before he acted or spoke. What he said, therefore, had all the weight that attaches to the utterance of a man of high character, and gave a warning that if Lord Selborne could have reconciled himself to the Bill, there must have been grave reasons to induce him to act as he had done. On the nights of August 4th and 5th the Lords inserted their amendments in the Bill, the Government when it ventured to divide being in a hopeless minority, as the Conservative Peers were reinforced by a large contingent of independent Liberals. The amendments of the Lords may be divided into three heads—those that removed what were thought to be glaring injustices, those that redressed the balance in favour of the landlords in minor matters, and those which remedied defects of phraseology. The amendments of the Lords were considered by the Commons during the following week, and just as the Lords supported everything proposed by the leaders of the Opposition so the Commons supported by majorities equally sweeping everything proposed by Mr. Gladstone. The amendments remedying defects of phraseology were welcomed, and many of those dealing with minor points were accepted as they stood, or with slight modifications. The main amendments, dealing with what Lord Salisbury called the glaring injustices of the Bill, were dealt with in two ways—some were altogether rejected, and some were met with concessions. Many of the concessions thus made were received with so much disfavour by the Irish party and by some extreme Liberals, that not only had the Government to reconsider some of its own amendments, but the debate was so protracted that it was only terminated by a Committee being appointed in the middle of the night to carry the Bill as amended to the three Peers who were sitting up in a state of extreme misery to receive it. As the Government had announced that it had stretched conciliation to the utmost possible point, and the Bill must now stand or fall as it was, it was expected that the Lords would accept a necessary evil, and let Mr. Gladstone have his way. This was not, however, at all the mood in which it was found that Lord Salisbury and the Opposition were prepared to deal with the Bill as then submitted to them. Where the Government had made no concessions, the glaring injustices complained of were once more summarily removed. Where the Government had made concessions, these concessions were sometimes rejected as insufficient, sometimes accepted with modifications, and sometimes accepted as they stood. Lord Salisbury adhered to the decision he had announced that the Government should have the responsibility of the measure, but only after the Bill had been shaped so that things to which he specially objected had been removed.

The history of the principal amendments may be summed up as follows. Estates or holdings managed after the English fashion were taken out of the operation of the Bill—that is, estates where the improvements had been created, to which Lord Salisbury added "or acquired" and substantially maintained, or, as he preferred to put it, in the main upheld by the landlord. The Lords inserted a clause giving the landlord who had bought up the tenant-right a claim to be repaid out of the purchase-money paid by a new tenant. This was struck out in the Commons, and reproduced by the Lords in the mitigated form of a provision that, where the holding is sold for the first time under the provisions

of this Act, the landlord may apply to the Court to apportion him any part of the purchase-money to which the Court shall think he is justly entitled. The Lords inserted and the Commons accepted a provision that the landlord's rent should be a preferential charge on the purchase-money in case of a sale. The new scale for disturbance was struck out by the Lords, restored by the Commons, and again struck out by the Lords. The same fate met the provision that the Court should, in settling a fair rent, have regard to the interests of the landlord and tenant respectively, and the provision enabling the Court to quash existing leases unfairly forced on the tenant. The Lords inserted an amendment that the rent as fixed by the Court should not be reduced on account of any money paid by the tenant to any one else than the landlord. The Commons rejected this, but proposed that the tenant should have no allowance for improvements for which he had been compensated by the landlord. The Lords restored their amendment in the shape that the amount paid for the holding should not of itself, apart from other considerations, be deemed a ground for increasing or reducing the rent. The Lords struck out the clause giving holders under existing leases a right to continue as present tenants on the expiry of the lease. The Commons restored the clause, with a proviso that, at the end of a lease the landlord might resume land which he needed for his own occupation, but without power to relet, except under a present tenancy for fifteen years. The Lords insisted on the clause being altogether struck out. It was finally agreed that there should be an appeal from the Land Commission to the Irish Court of Appeal in other cases, but not in any respect of questions of disturbance, or on the amount of fair rent, or any question of value or damages, or any matter left to the discretion of the Court. The Lords struck out the condition in regard to the purchase of estates, that three-fourths of the tenants should concur in an application, and it was proposed by Mr. Gladstone, and accepted by the Lords, that the necessary number might be reduced to one-half in special cases with the consent of the Treasury. In the same way it was ultimately agreed that the landlord should have access to the Court not only when he has demanded an increase of rent refused by the tenant, but also where he has failed to come to an agreement with the tenant as to what is a fair rent. Both Houses agreed that the tenant might erect new dwellings on his holding in lieu of old ones; but the Commons proposed and the Lords rejected a proviso that the tenant should be allowed to use as dwelling-houses buildings not so used previously. The Lords struck out the proviso that during the first judicial lease fixed by the Court the landlord should not have power to resume, except for the benefit of the labourers. This was restored by the Commons, and again struck out by the Lords. Lastly, Mr. Parnell's clause was struck out by the Lords, and altered by the Commons so as to give the tenant a respite from all proceedings, including those in bankruptcy, but the power of the Court was limited so as to protect him in cases in which the Court might see its way to stating that a judicial rent would be fixed within three months. The Lords again struck out the clause altogether. It was obvious that when the Bill left the Lords after the consideration of the Commons' amendments there were many disputed points on which the Houses had come to an agreement, and that where they still disagreed there were points on which further discussion might lead to an agreement, such as the definition of an English-managed estate, the apportionment of purchase-money by the Court where the landlord had bought up the tenant-right, the declaration that the money paid for a holding should not in itself increase or reduce the rent, the liberty to the tenant to use pig-styes as homes, and the Parnell clause, which in the shape it left the Commons mixed up other creditors with landlords, and made the protection of the tenant depend, not on the justice of his case, but on the state of business in a Court. On the other hand, there could be no hope that the Government would consider the Bill to be its Bill if the provisions directing that regard should be paid to the interests of the tenant, as well as to those of the landlord, those protecting the leaseholder, and those respecting the scale of compensation for disturbance, were omitted.

For a day or two after the action thus taken by the Lords the air was filled with disquieting rumours. It was said that a serious political crisis had arisen, that the Bill was lost, and that the Lords had placed themselves in decided antagonism to the Commons. Those, however, who took the trouble to examine in detail the amendments of the Lords were aware that on many points the Lords were incontestably right, and that, if a proper spirit of reasonableness and conciliation was shown by the Ministry, and accepted with good temper by the Lords, there was no real reason why the Bill should be considered in any serious danger. When Mr. Gladstone rose on August 15 to move that the Lords' amendments should be considered, refused to make any general statement, and insisted that each amendment should be judged on its merits, it was evident that such danger as there might have been had passed away. Mr. Gladstone, in his blandest manner, explained that there were concessions he could not make, but that there were several important amendments made by the Lords to which he could not make the objection that they injured the Bill. The amendment of Lord Salisbury substituting "in the main upheld" for "substantially maintained," with regard to English-managed estates, was rejected, as was the clause giving the Court power to pay out of the purchase-money of a tenant-right what had been paid by the landlord; that altering the new scale of compensation for disturbance; Lord Pembroke's amendment as to deterioration; Lord Lansdowne's

amendment as to resumption during the first statutory term, while the giving the position of a present tenant to a leaseholder whose lease has expired was subjected to a limitation so nominal—namely, that the leases in question must fall in within sixty years—that the clause as drafted by the Government was virtually restored. On the other hand, the provisions inserted by the Lords extending the definition of game to wild-fowl, and authorizing the landlord to apply to the Court in case he cannot agree with the tenant as to a fair rent, were accepted, and the Government agreed that tenants' improvements, paid for or otherwise compensated by the landlord, should not be taken into account on behalf of the tenant. Mr. Russell's words, that the Court should have regard to the interests of landlord and tenant respectively, were reinserted; but Lord Salisbury's important amendment that the sum paid by the tenant should not be deemed a ground for increasing or reducing the rent was accepted. Lastly, Mr. Parnell's clause as to the staying of actions was entirely omitted. The extreme section of the Irish members were vehement in their outcries at what they called the surrender made by the Government; but it was evident that, not only must any concessions made by the Government in order to get the Bill through be accepted by their followers, but that the Bill had really been much improved by the Lords. With some slight modifications, the Bill as now sent back to them was accepted by the Lords. The long contest was at an end, and the Irish Land Bill only needed the Royal Assent to become law. No sooner had this result been achieved than the interest of members in their work, which had been extraordinarily prolonged, collapsed altogether. The remaining fortnight was occupied almost wholly in routine business, such as the conclusion of Supply, the Indian Budget statement, and the Appropriation Bill. For a time it seemed as if the Irish members were determined to resist the progress of business, in order to complain of the refusal of an amnesty to all the suspected persons imprisoned in Ireland under the Coercion Act. Virulent attacks were made by some of them on Mr. Forster, and duly resented by Mr. Gladstone and Sir William Harcourt. But, almost the only event of practical interest was the defeat of the Government on the motion of the Attorney-General for an Election Commission at Wigan. The Lancashire Liberals resisted the proposal, and, with the aid of the Conservatives and a few Irish members, defeated it by a majority of six. Of the minor measures passed at this eleventh hour, only the Newspapers (Law of Libel) Bill, the Welsh Sunday Closing Bill, and the Supreme Court of Judicature Bill deserve notice.

The Session was not without serious troubles and difficulties for the Government. The Land Bill cost it a painful separation from the Duke of Argyll, who preferred to end his long and faithful intimacy with Mr. Gladstone rather than be responsible for a measure which confused the elementary notions of property. He was replaced by Lord Carlingford, who was specially fitted to represent the Government when the Irish Land Bill reached the Upper House, but who could ill replace the general power in debate of the Duke of Argyll in an assembly where the Ministry has little debating power at its command. The Duke had spoken with the fulness of his copious and laboured force when, at an earlier period of the Session, the Government was attacked in the House of Lords for its abandonment of Candahar, and was defeated by a majority more than double the slender muster of its supporters. The counter vote of approval was proposed and carried a month later in the Commons. It was impossible, perhaps, that a Liberal Government should have retreated from the pledges which it had given at the time of the elections and subsequently, and opinions might reasonably differ as to the policy of leaving or not leaving Afghanistan to itself; but when Sir Charles Dilke made capital out of the alleged recall of General Skobeleff, he took refuge in an argument false in itself, and signally refuted by the subsequent advance of Russia, which has gained a position commanding not only Merv, but Herat, while the victory of Ayoub Khan has apparently placed Afghanistan at the feet of the only Afghan who has ever beaten a British army. The Transvaal was a still more thorny and disquieting subject. At the end of last year the insurgent Boers had suddenly attacked an English regiment, and an English officer was soon afterwards foully and treacherously murdered. It was announced in the Queen's Speech that the authority of the Crown must be upheld before any concessions could be made, and Mr. Gladstone pointed out, in clear and impressive language, that nothing could be worse for South Africa generally than any arrangements made with rebels in the field. The English public learnt with grief and pain that Sir George Colley, who was in command of the Queen's forces, had sustained first one and then another and then a third defeat, in the last of which he himself perished. Sir Frederick Roberts had been sent out to command the army, which had been greatly increased, and it was supposed that the strength of England would be put forth in an unmistakable way, when the Government announced that it had come to terms with the rebels in the field, that it had determined to give the Boers the independence they demanded, and that the Queen was to retain nothing but a shadowy suzerainty. Lord Cairns immediately reviewed the conduct of the Government in a speech equally elaborate and conclusive; but it was not for months afterwards that Sir Michael Hicks Beach could find an opportunity of moving a vote of censure in the Commons. A faithful majority rejected the motion, and it was evident that Parliament, if not the country, regretted that the Transvaal had ever been annexed, was ready to undo the

annexation, and had no wish that useless blood should have continued to be shed. But no majority and no Ministerial arguments could relieve the Government from the imputation of having, through sheer mismanagement, sacrificed uselessly the lives of British soldiers, and subjected a British force to humiliating defeats. The Government said that before those defeats it had begun to listen to the appeal of the Boers for an arrangement; but, if so, it had no excuse for permitting operations in the field which, if unsuccessful, as they proved to be, would be very damaging to England, and which, if successful, would have made an amicable arrangement superfluous or impossible. In a smaller way the Government was much inconvenienced by the proceedings of Mr. Bradlaugh, who, when a Court of Appeal decided against his contention that he could legally affirm, resigned his seat, was re-elected, although by a small majority, presented himself at the bar of the House, and asked to be allowed to take the oath. Mr. Gladstone contended that legally he was entitled to take the oath; he was a new member, and, when a new member offers to swear, no one can inquire as to the secret and inner meaning he attaches to the words he uses. Sir Stafford Northcote contended, and was supported by a majority in the contention, that, although this was quite true of new members generally, the House could and ought to take notice that Mr. Bradlaugh was a person who the House had already voted should not be allowed to take an oath which he had declared to have no meaning for him. Fresh legislation, as Sir Stafford Northcote pointed out, was the only means of solving the difficulty. To this Mr. Gladstone agreed, and the Attorney-General at once brought in a Bill allowing all members to affirm. But it soon became evident that the unwillingness to see an atheist take his seat did not reside so much in Parliament or the Parliamentary Opposition as in the constituencies, both Liberal and Conservative. The Bill of the Attorney-General was first allowed to languish, and was then withdrawn, being killed, like so many other Bills, by the one monster Bill of the Session. Mr. Bradlaugh, having again presented himself to take the oath, was formally excluded by the House from entering it. So long as the Land Bill was in progress he bore his exclusion patiently, but he has very recently made a foolish attempt to brave the authority of Parliament, and has met with the mild punishment which he courted. It is some consolation in a disturbed time that he is now of much less importance than he was a short time ago. The same, too, may be said of the Land League fraction of the Home Rule party. Long ago Mr. Shaw, Mr. Smyth, Mr. Mitchell Henry, and all the Home Rulers of position and respectability, openly broke with the Land League and Mr. Parnell. The score of members who still obeyed Mr. Parnell, and obeyed him perhaps more blindly than ever, carried obstruction to lengths unknown before, abused the Government and every member of it with the coarsest vituperation, plied Mr. Forster with annoying questions, and denounced him as the curse of Ireland; but their power of mischief grew gradually less after obstruction was overcome, when Mr. Forster was supported not only by Mr. Gladstone, but by the general sympathy of the House, when it became obvious that the Irish people did not approve of the vexatious resistance offered by Mr. Parnell to the Land Bill, and, above all, when it was found that the extreme wing of the Irish party was having recourse to dastardly attempts at assassination and destruction of English public property. The attempt to blow up the Mansion House was followed by the attempt to blow up the Town Hall at Liverpool, and then again by the attempt to introduce into Liverpool explosive machines from New York. The assassination of the Czar and the attempted assassination of the American President necessarily awoke society to the new dangers with which its chiefs are in these days surrounded. The Home Secretary, with the marked concurrence of the House, showed a firm front to these lawless assailants of society. He warned the public that the dangers of which he knew, and of which the public did not know, were real and serious; he frankly owned that he would have recourse when he pleased to his unpopular, but perfectly legal, power of opening letters; he instituted a successful prosecution against a wretched German who had preached assassination in a paper published in England; and he denounced in the strongest terms the kindred press in America which teaches the Irish in and out of Ireland how they are to bring the English Government on its knees by the free use of dynamite.

During the Easter recess an event took place which profoundly touched English society, from the throne to the cottage, and gave a new and a poorer colouring to English public life. On April the 19th Lord Beaconsfield died, after an illness every turn of which had been watched with keen anxiety and eager interest. Every section of the public paid a ready tribute of admiration to the memory of one who, if not a great statesman, was the most brilliant of party leaders, and who had pursued a striking and original career till he had attained the highest crown of his ambition. All that could or should have been said on such an occasion in Parliament was said by Lord Granville and Lord Salisbury in the Lords, and by Mr. Gladstone and Sir Stafford Northcote in the Commons, and a very small minority was found to support Mr. Labouchere in his opposition to the natural proposal to honour the memory of Lord Beaconsfield by the erection of a national monument in Westminster Abbey. As chief of his party Lord Beaconsfield was not replaced, but Lord Salisbury was chosen to succeed him as leader of the Conservative majority in the House of Lords. For the position thus assigned him Lord Salisbury was marked out by an exceptional combination of intel-

lectual ability, debating power, and high social position, and time has already shown that, in addition to his other qualities, he has the wisdom to know when to yield and the moderation to know when to spare. As the Government, in order to secure the passage of the Land Bill, withdrew all Bills that could raise contention, there was little opportunity for observing how the leader of the majority in the Lords would treat the minor measures of their opponents; but there was no trace of domineering or partiality in the objection raised by Lord Salisbury to the Charitable Trusts Bill, that it made nonentities of local trustees, or in the slight alteration introduced by Lord Cairns into the Court of Appeal Bill when he deprived the puisne judges of the invidious privilege of electing from their body three temporary Judges of Appeal. The death of Mr. Adam, so long the Whip of the Liberal party, called forth a fitting expression of esteem and regret not only from Mr. Gladstone, but also from Sir Stafford Northcote. The Budget was wholly uninteresting, Mr. Gladstone making up for a slight deficit due to the taking off from the Income-tax of the penny last year by an augmentation of Probate duties and a change in the mode of collecting the duties on spirits, and the great reforming financier of the age would have done nothing in finance of which the public could take cognizance had he not proposed a grant to India in aid of the expenses of the Afghan war, which seemed small after all that had been said of the duty of England to avoid charging impoverished India with the cost of an Imperial war, had he not thought of the simple and popular device of making one stamp do both for postage and receipts, and had he not proposed an ingenious scheme for reducing the National Debt by prolonging a portion of the Terminable Annuities soon to expire so as to substitute them for the Consols held by Government offices. Mr. Childers expounded with ability and carried with almost uncontested success his last new scheme for reorganizing the army, and Mr. Trevelyan justified his promotion by a sketch of what has been done, is being done, and is to be done for the navy, which was at once lucid, complete, and interesting. Mr. Courtney has also been twice promoted, and now that he is in the office of which he was at one time the sole critic proved to be in the right, he has an opportunity of fulfilling the high expectations he once raised; while in Mr. Grant Duff, who has replaced Mr. Adam at Madras, the Ministry has lost a member whose zeal and knowledge, alike varied and inexhaustible, gave him a special place in Parliament. It is in the sphere of foreign politics that the Government has, apart from the Land Bill, been most successful from a party point of view. Sir Charles Dilke has parried or answered difficult or dangerous questions with an adroitness and firmness which were never found wanting, and with the happiest ignorance when ignorance was required. Mr. Goschen has led the European Concert in settling the Greek question without war and without unfairness to either of the contending parties, and has exhibited in the settlement of this complicated business a resolution and an alternation of stiffness and pliability which received the cordial acknowledgment not only of Lord Granville, but of Lord Salisbury. When France was found to have embarked in its rash adventure for the subjugation of Tunis, Lord Granville accepted the situation which had been created for him, allowed France fair play, and was most polite and considerate to M. St. Hilaire, but firmly insisted that England must retain every right in Tunis secured by treaty, pointed out the diplomatic difficulties to which the arrogant assumption of French officials must lead, and declared that the position of England in Egypt must not be assailed, and that she would decidedly object to France as a neighbour to Egypt in Tripoli. The House of Commons has viewed with natural impatience the obstacles interposed by France in the way of a renewal of the Treaty of Commerce, but it only wished to strengthen the hands of the Government when, in spite of the formal opposition of the Ministry, it gave vent to this impatience in a vote which committed it to little or nothing. Nothing has indicated that, to any serious degree, the Ministry has yet lost its hold on the country. On two occasions during the discussion of the Land Bill a section of the Liberal party, more weighty in social position and in private character than in numbers, broke away from the ties that ordinarily bind them, and Mr. Goschen since his return has more than once shown his resolution to occupy an independent ground. But, on the whole, the vast Liberal majority has clung to its chief with singular fidelity and tenacity. When the Ministry begins to grapple with the long series of questions which it came into office to solve, and still more when age or the lassitude consequent on a great and unparalleled effort deprives it of the commanding influence of Mr. Gladstone in the House of Commons, the real struggle of parties will begin.

A LESSON IN HUMOUR.

THERE is good authority for not expecting to find figs growing on thistles. But it will be acknowledged by every one that, if a fig were discovered in that unusual position, great and remarkable interest would be felt in it. According to the chief supporters of the present Premier, something like this miracle has recently been noticeable in the case of Mr. Gladstone. Friends and enemies alike have always agreed to recognize remarkable gifts in the right honourable gentleman; but friends and enemies alike have agreed that among those gifts humour is not exactly the most prominent. When Mr. Gladstone attempts to make a joke, his admirers tremble and his foes uplift their horn. The jest

usually consists of the citation or adaptation of comic poetry of a very peculiar kind, so peculiar that it is not known whether Mr. Gladstone keeps a special private poet, or, emulous of Canning, elaborates his poetical jokes himself. The celebrated ballad of "The Three Jolly Allsoppes," the more ancient, but scarcely less remarkable, ditty in which "bacca" rhymed to "Malacca," are perhaps the most famous of Mr. Gladstone's productions when he is in merry pin. The recognition of humour in either of these unbendings would add a new intricacy to the task of defining that much-debated word. Indeed, the *Daily News*, which may be taken as an indisputable witness in a certain sense, admits that Mr. Gladstone has not hitherto been celebrated as a jester. But now, it seems, all is changed. The stately but aged tree "miratur novas frondes et non sua poma." "Of late Mr. Gladstone has added to his former gifts a playful humour and an irony which has more of good-nature and compassion in it," &c.; while the *Pall Mall Gazette*, obsequiously endeavouring to cap the contemporary which had some hours' start of it, is eloquent about "the heavier fruitages of thought" and "the lighter flowers of imagination." The writer of the Parliamentary summary in the morning journal characterizes the speech on which this estimate is founded as "one of the most humorous ever delivered in the House," which, considering the history of that House, may be said to be strong language. Very luckily the same authority vouches for the verbatim accuracy of the accompanying report. There can therefore be no difficulty in examining this surprising new species of a great genus—the Gladstonian humour. Shakspeare, Butler, Swift, Fielding, Sheridan, Canning, Thackeray—the diapason closes full in Mr. Gladstone.

It will be admitted by all impartial persons that the Premier had at least something more than a fair chance of displaying the gifts which the gods have, according to his supporters, showered upon his old age, making it veritably the best of life. His theme was Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett, and the highest respect for the excellence of Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett's intentions is compatible with a recognition of the fact that those intentions do not invariably result in expression of complete felicity. A well-meaning man dealing with subjects about which most of his hearers know nothing and care less needs a very considerable oratorical or literary talent to escape the possibility of ridicule. Supposing, for instance, that Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett had been a Liberal, and that Lord Beaconsfield were alive, and in the House of Commons, the late (in that case future) volume of *Wit and Wisdom* would probably have been increased by not a few sayings which the Parliamentary world would not willingly let die. With a good subject, a sympathetic audience, and a mind jocund and divine with political success, it was certainly the time for Mr. Gladstone to show the colour of his humour. He began, "He had some doubt whether he ought not to allow the speech to be buried in the midst of the solemn silence which appeared in all quarters to have been prepared for its interment. (Laughter)." If there is any humour here it apparently lies in the phrase preparing silence, which has at least the merit of being unusual. Would Mr. Gladstone tell us how to prepare silence? To prepare speech is certainly possible, but the preparation of silence seems a little difficult. Besides, as Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett's speech appears to have been diversified, not merely with "Hear, hears," but with "Ohs," cries of "Withdraw," polite contradictions by zealous Liberals, &c. &c., the strict accuracy of the description seems as questionable as its humour or intelligibility. Perhaps Mr. Gladstone had prepared, not silence, but his remark about the preparation of silence, and felt bound to use it. In the following sentence he remarked that "he should not go too far if he were to call Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett's speech outrageous." This was certainly running very bad humours on him in Nym's sense, but in any other it can hardly be said that it is very humorous to call a man or a speech outrageous. The next two points which the amateurs of Gladstonian humour laughed at were the statement that Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett had come forward to do his duty to his country (laughter), and the statement that there was an audience of only two persons on his own side of the House. (Laughter.) It is, indeed, not impossible that the idea of a member of Parliament thinking that his duty to his country required him to speak when he thought his country was going wrong may have seemed humorous to a few advanced Radicals; but even these gentlemen can hardly, we should think, see anything particularly full of humour in Mr. Gladstone's statement of the fact. Then the Prime Minister said that everything which his enemy asserted he denied, and everything which Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett denied he asserted. A roar of laughter greeted this novel and exquisite device of oratory, which, if we recollect rightly, Mr. Gladstone applied some time ago to Lord Randolph Churchill, so that it is evidently a favourite of his. "I think, sir," proceeded the Premier, "that the application of that succinct formula will dispose of the whole of the oration we have heard." As there could be no conceivable case in which the succinct formula would not dispose of the whole of any oration of any orator in the history of politics and literature, the "laughter" which followed seems a little inexplicable. Besides, Mr. Gladstone has forgotten that there is a still more succinct formula of equivalent meaning, which is also thought humorous in certain circles, and of which his friend and colleague the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster is very fond. Then Mr. Gladstone said that it was painful to him to be in a position of mortal antagonism to Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett (and his obedient henchmen laughed), and he said that Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett referred to the pain he was inflicting upon him, Mr. Gladstone (here they laughed consumedly), and he said that he was truly

thankful for Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett's sympathy (here they laughed again). "He would," said the Premier, "endeavour to bear up against it till Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett gave him his quietus"; and at this masterpiece of entirely original humour roars of mirth were heard. Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett said that Cyprus gave command over the land routes of the future, which is as simple a matter of fact as if he said that Gibraltar commands the Straits. Mr. Gladstone repeated the phrase, and his followers howled with delight. We have no doubt that they privately implored him not to repeat it again, for they really should die of laughing. They laughed when he said that Mr. Warton had arrived with an armful of books, and they laughed when he said that Mr. Warton was reserving his store for one of the later orders of the day. Shrieks of hilarity greeted the statement that Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett doubtless had millions in his pocket to make a harbour at Cyprus—a harbour, be it remembered, which Admiral Sir G. P. Hornby, who knows something more about harbours and Cyprus than even Mr. Gladstone, says can be made for a couple of hundred thousand pounds. More shrieks welcomed the quotation about the Spanish fleet, and here there is no fault to find, for there certainly is humour there, though it is hardly Mr. Gladstone's. We do not know that we have space to continue the dissection of this new kind of humour, the finest flowers of which, save one, have been honestly given. That one must not be missed. "I wish to leave these observations free course throughout the whole world, to circulate and distil themselves, if they could or would, into the minds of civilized mankind, in order that the digestions of the various cultivated races might dispose of them in the proper manner." Beyond this it is evident that the force of refined and lambent humour can no further go. The appropriate consecration of the metaphors, the neat precision of the phrase, the infinity of humorous suggestion conveyed, certainly justify the eulogies bestowed on the latest English humourist.

Now we have not the least intention of throwing any blame or ridicule upon Mr. Gladstone for this utterance of his. When a young man who has no particular gifts of eloquence makes an inconvenient speech—and Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett's speeches, with all their faults, are generally very inconvenient speeches for the present Government—an old man of authority and command of language has, in face of an ignorant audience, no better game to play than to take them good-humouredly, and, if he can, to make fun of them. He is nearly sure of success, because his audience does not know the truths of fact that underlie the awkward manner, and is quite prepared to laugh when the signal is given. Mr. Gladstone's jests are on a par with Sir Charles Dilke's elaborate ignorance of the contents of the *République Française*—a reactionary paper, edited and inspired by persons whom Sir Charles holds in horror—of the methods of communication between London and Meshed, of the antecedents of Herr Most, &c. They are polemical utterances, and quite fairly polemical. If members of the British House of Commons choose to know nothing about very obvious and simple facts, they invite their leader to exploit their ignorance in the way most convenient to him. But what is to be said of the admiration which holds up utterly commonplace exertations in dialectic sarcasm as evidences of a precious and delicate faculty of humour vouchsafed as a last and crowning gift to a great master of eloquence? The concluding sentence of Mr. Gladstone's speech is really worth quoting as an instance of the playful irony, the good-natured humour, and all the rest of it:—"Let him learn this—that if he really wants to make an impression on the world; if he really wants to give aid to his friends and to inflict disaster on his adversaries, the very first lesson he must learn is to restrain his universal and sweeping propositions within bounds of fact and actual experience, to submit himself to be taught by the lessons of the world and the lessons of the day, and to learn and know that moderation, reserve, consideration for those with whom you have to deal and the endeavour to bring your propositions into exact conformity with the circumstances of the case, are for him and for everybody else the very first conditions of useful and durable success." Admirable advice, truly—but humorous? The speaker of the Midlothian speeches counsels moderation, reserve, consideration for those with whom he has to deal. Mr. Gladstone complains of universal and sweeping propositions. The Minister who had humbly to apologize for the impolicy and inaccuracy of his onslaughts on a friendly Power talks about the importance of bringing your propositions into exact conformity with the circumstances of the case. There is certainly humour here, but it is of the most unconscious. There is also certainly something else than humour—namely, an exuberance and a loquacity which—but here we are plagiarizing. Only let it be said that if this is going to be the humour of the future, we sincerely trust that we shall have as few humourists as possible. Fortunately the past exists—and when Mr. Gladstone or any of his imitators begin a humorous speech, the Librarian of the House of Commons will perhaps see that there are sufficient copies ready in the Library of the *Anatomy of an Equivalent*, of the *History of John Bull*, and of the *Anti-Jacobin*, to counteract any bad effects which the style may produce on the younger members of the House. Perhaps, also, though this is less probable, a slight perception of what is and what is not humour may dawn upon Mr. Gladstone's admirers before long, and they may adjust their standards of imitation accordingly.

TURTLES AND INSECTS.

MOST readers of *Punch* will remember a picture representing a railway porter holding a tortoise in his hand and addressing an old lady in these remarkable words:—"Station-master says that rabbits is dogs and cats is dogs, but this 'ere's a insect, and there aint no charge." This somewhat arbitrary classification has been undesignedly imitated by the Zoological Society, who have placed their new Insectarium in close proximity to the tortoise sheds, and have even devoted a tank in the insect-house itself to some members of the turtle tribe. Few words are so suggestive as "turtle." To the official dinner-out or City magnate it calls up reminiscences of heavy feeds, rapid speeches, and much boredom and indigestion; but the epicure, if he be "healthy, wealthy, and wise," can dwell with satisfaction on "calipash and calipee," and the more dainty fins subtly dressed with truffles. The thoughts inspired by the mention of the delicacy are for the most part pleasant, unless it be to the mariner who, having sojourned at Ascension Island, has lived on nothing else for months, or whose experiences include that of his vessel "turning turtle"—i.e. turning completely over in the water, a manoeuvre which cannot be accomplished without inconvenience to those on board. The application of the name "turtle" to that species of pigeon which is metaphorically used to illustrate happy marriage, of course gives it an entirely different significance to many people; and there is again the Biblical association of ideas, such as occurred to the young traveller in Mark Twain's humorous account of his "New Pilgrim's Progress" through the Holy Land. The youth was sitting pensively in the broiling sun beside a little rill watching a "mud turtle," with the expressed intention of heaving a rock at it as soon as a certain term which he had proposed to himself should expire. Being asked for an explanation of his conduct, he said that Colonel Church had told them at prayers, and had even read out of the Bible, that the country they were in was "flowing with milk and honey," and that "the voice of the turtle was heard in the land." "I've sat there," he continued, "and watched that turtle nearly an hour to-day, and I am almost burned up with the sun, but I never heard him sing. I'll give him ten minutes to come—ten minutes; and then, if he don't, down goes his building!"

The habits of the turtle may be studied in the windows of certain restaurants, although the limited accommodation cramps the energies even of so sluggish an animal. In the Zoological Society's Gardens some varieties of the species may be seen to greater advantage. There, on a bright morning, the terrapin tanks and the tortoise sheds and paddocks present an appearance of quite unwonted animation. The "old man terrapin," whose general appearance is that of a sandwich roughly constructed out of two pieces of knotty oak-tree bark and old rags, with the edges of the latter left loose, will be seen gaily snapping up little fish; the alligator terrapin, protruding his long neck and tail, and trying to look as much like his namesake as possible, sallies forth from his pond, seeking what he may devour. The monster land tortoises feed ravenously on turnips and other vegetables, snapping great pieces out with their parrot-like bills; while the smaller kinds waddle anxiously about, and look, especially from behind, like fat old gentlemen in overcoats, intent on botanical researches. Some of the larger specimens, when engaged upon their morning meal, are the exact counterpart of the one figured in the illustrations to Bon Gaultier's celebrated ballad of the "Snapping Turtle," in which the habits and appearance of the ferocious reptile are so well described:—

And the waters boiled and bubbled;
And in groups of twos and threes,
Several alligators bounded,
Smart as squirrels up the trees.
Then a hideous head was lifted,
With such huge distended jaws,
That they might have held Goliath
Quite as well as Rufus Dawes.

There are no alligators and no trees in the tortoise paddock at the Zoo; but it is a scientific fact that the *Trionyx ferox* will bite a young alligator in half; so that the conduct of those mentioned in the ballad, although eccentric, is not unreasonable. The snapping turtle well deserves its name; for, if works on natural history are to be believed, the fingers of imprudent and inexperienced sailors seem to form its staple food.

The tortoise has not accomplished the feat of taking off its flesh and sitting in its bones, but it has done the next thing to it. It is the first example of a skeleton brought to the surface; the back is incapable of movement, and the scales with which a less ambitious reptile is content have developed into the horny shield which covers it, while the bones of the chest have developed into a box capable of containing the creature, head and legs and all. In fact, if we belonged to a past generation when inane plays upon words were taken for wit, we should have most probably said that the chest of the tortoise is a box to hold its trunk. The horny integument of the *Schild-kroete*, "Shield-Toad," as our Teutonic brethren so graphically call him, is scarcely less rich in associations than his family name, suggesting, amongst a crowd of other memories, the high tortoiseshell combs, short waists, whist and pump-room manners of the beauties of the Regency. The arrangement for wearing the skeleton outside, and packing the whole body away in the case formed by it, is convenient, but not an absolute protection against foes. The lithe and wily panther, for

instance, has a habit of inserting his paw into the opening left for the protrusion of the head, and thus extracting the animal. The turtle, moreover, is at a decided disadvantage when turned over on its back, which is a favourite method of securing those which come ashore to lay their eggs. Against ordinary dangers the thick shield is a very useful safeguard; but the impossibility of receiving any impression through the skin of the body must have its disadvantages too. How, for instance, does a tortoise manage in those cases which a cow provides against by a rubbing post? Supposing it to be possible for him to suffer from any such inconvenience, he would be even worse off than a mediæval knight armed *cap-à-pie*, beneath whose steel panoply a specimen of the domestic *pulex* had secreted itself.

Of the specimens of the turtle tribe at the Zoological Gardens the most interesting are the alligator terrapin and the salt-water terrapin, both of which we have already described. They are considered a great delicacy in the United States, especially the ragged-edged variety. Of the ordinary edible turtles, better known in this country, the "green turtle" is the best. This species is found in great abundance in Ascension Island, where they are captured and kept in ponds for exportation. Their great tenacity of life facilitates their preservation, and it is a well-known fact that the head of a turtle will live, and snap at anything put in its way, for some time after it has been severed from the body; while the heart will pulsate for hours after being removed. When the season for depositing their eggs in the sand is over, and the turtles no longer come ashore, they are hunted in the water. This is done in boats. The turtle is pursued until fatigue or fright induces it to cease swimming and sink to the bottom, when it is transixed by a heavily-weighted and barbed harpoon, and so secured. Of the land tortoises, the smaller ones, often sold in great numbers in our streets, are, for the most part, brought over as ballast. They are a very useful addition to a lawn or grass-plot, killing the worms and noxious insects; and, as they live to an immense age, and require no attention at all, they are not an unprofitable investment.

The Insectarium is well worth a visit for its more immediate and legitimate contents. Here are to be seen many sorts of beautiful butterflies and moths—both British and foreign—in various stages of development. The present time is very favourable for observing them, as they are now just leaving the chrysalis state. Then, again, there are tiger beetles darting fiercely about in jars of water; and specimens of the curious leaf insect, which can hardly be distinguished from the leaves of the tree on which it feeds. But most curious and interesting of all is a little colony of trapdoor spiders' nests; unfortunately, without inhabitants. This insect, which is a native of Jamaica, digs a hole in the ground, and lines it with a silken web; the mouth of this is closed by a trapdoor, with a hinge, which permits of its being opened and closed with perfect accuracy. The door is circular, and is made of alternate layers of earth and web. The trapdoor spider gains its livelihood by hunting at night and by catching insects in the nets which it spreads beside its door. The Society also possesses a specimen of a gigantic spider from the West Indies, whose ordinary food is cockroaches, but which is said to be able to kill and devour a mouse. In the Fiji Islands, where cockroaches are a real pest, spiders of this kind are a blessing to society, and no housewife would dream of allowing their webs to be disturbed. The tarantula, of uncanny reputation, is also there, but not alive. The spider is so called from the town of Tarentum in Italy, amongst the inhabitants of which the belief existed that a certain nervous disease was produced by its bite, which could only be cured by music. The insect is really perfectly harmless to man, and the epidemic was due to hysterical excitement.

The arachnida are most interesting insects, and many a half-hour might be worse spent than by watching the habits of a spider which has taken up its residence among the plants in the conservatory or on the window-sill. Very carefully does he choose the most convenient hunting ground, and that where flies do chiefly congregate. With great pains and ingenuity does he carry out stays to distant twigs, and with great perseverance and mathematical precision does he weave the bands between until a perfect polygonal reticulation is made, terminating in a point in the middle, which he twists and pulls until the whole structure is taut. Then, having tested its strength in all parts, he rests satisfied with his work, and lies in wait until some heedless vagrant fly entangles itself in the meshes of the out-stretched net. In a moment the spider is all excitement and activity; if the capture be small enough, he carts it off with lightning rapidity to his lurking place, and feeds on it at leisure. If, on the other hand, it be large and unmanageable, he makes for it at once, attacks it fiercely, and fastens on it until it is dead, thus securing his net from damage by the struggles of the fly, and, at the same time, a hearty meal for himself. The Insectarium is a valuable addition to the attractions of the Society's collections; it is at present only in its infancy, but will, no doubt, develop into an important establishment. The more facilities there are for the minute and accurate study of the lower forms of life, the more will the conditions of the highest form, the human, be understood. From this point of view turtles and insects are alike able to impart many a valuable lesson.

POCOCURANTISM.

IN one of the letters "to an old pupil" published in *Arnold's Life and Correspondence* we have a vigorous denunciation of what the writer calls "Pococurantism." And as the "value of Veneration" is given in the Table of Contents as the subject of the letter, his biographer must have understood him to mean by pococurantism the opposite quality. His own description of the fault he is criticizing harmonizes with this estimate. He identifies it with the Horatian maxim of *Nil admirari*, which he calls "the Devil's favourite text," and the best he could choose "to introduce his pupils into the more esoteric part of his doctrine." He speaks of it partly as a special vice of the age, partly as a defect incidental to early life; it "is much the order of the day among young men." He had even observed inchoate tendencies that way among his boys at Rugby, and was "always dreading its ascendancy" there, though there were some who struggled nobly against it. As to the thing itself, he says he has "always looked upon a man infected with this disorder of anti-romance as on one who has lost the finest part of his nature and his best protection against everything low and foolish." He adds that such men may well call him mad, but he thinks their party are not yet strong enough to get him fairly shut up, and till they are, he shall "take the liberty of insisting that their tail is the longest." The outburst is a very characteristic one, though it may possibly enough surprise some who have been accustomed to regard Dr. Arnold simply as a modern Radical and Broad Churchman. This would be a most inadequate view of his real position. That "the bump of veneration" was strongly developed in his nature there can be little doubt, though he did not greatly venerate some objects for which several of his early Oxford friends entertained a high reverence, and was in the habit of dealing hard blows at the idols he wished to demolish. But it would be altogether a mistake to regard him solely or chiefly as an iconoclast, and we may safely add that, if he had been such, he would never have succeeded in eliciting the enthusiasm and accomplishing the work for which he is still remembered. That a spirit of flippancy and irreverence is a common however ungraceful feeling, not so much of boyhood—in their case it would be the result of evil training or example—as of youth or incipient manhood, is notorious. There is much of course in the newly acquired independence and the sense of rapidly maturing powers of a youth fresh from school or from the university to encourage such a feeling. In wonder, it has been justly said, philosophy begins and ends, and wonder is a reverential attitude of mind, but there is an intermediate stage of development, when confidence, not to say arrogance, supersedes it. Those who know nothing and those who know much have no difficulty in realizing the extent of their ignorance, but those who know a little are not equally ready to acknowledge how much remains unknown. It will be said by many that this sort of temper, or "disorder"—which used then to be called by a shorter and sharper name than pococurantism—was thought specially characteristic of Rugbeians at the university some forty years ago, as distinguished from their Etonian or Harrovian or other public school contemporaries. How far this was so, and how far it was due to Dr. Arnold's influence, are questions it hardly concerns us to revive now; it was clearly not the result he intended or desired to produce. But his letter suggests a wider question, which has certainly not lost its interest, as to the alleged decay of veneration in the present age, and the ethical estimate to be formed of it. The "anti-romance" school are not indeed yet strong enough to "shut up" their more romantic and reverential contemporaries, but it is often said or surmised that they are gaining strength, and we may fairly ask whether their advance, if they are advancing, should be welcomed or opposed.

In a purely utilitarian scheme of ethics the feeling of reverence, if it claims any place at all, must hold a very doubtful one. It becomes at best nothing more than a conviction that those whose superior power enables them to benefit or injure us will, in fact, only do us good. Hence Hobbes defines it, in its religious aspect, as "the conception we have concerning another, that He hath the power to do unto us both good and hurt, but not the will to do us hurt." And it has been plausibly argued that the great evils to which it has given rise, in the way both of religious superstition and political servitude, make it a source of more misery than happiness to the world, while, as it grows out of a sense of dependence, whether on God or man, the habits fostered by advancing civilization are thought to undermine its power in either sphere. A contemplation of the order of nature and the reign of universal and unchanging law has not, it is urged, at all the same tendency to awaken in ordinary minds feelings of veneration as a belief in the constant and direct interposition of Providence in natural phenomena. *Cælo tonantem credidimus Jovem* is the awestruck confession of a rude and barbarous age, but those who are familiar with the laws of electricity are content to look at nature, without caring, as the poet bids them, to "look through" it "up to" a higher Power beyond. Sailors, who are usually ignorant men, and are brought into habitual contact with the great forces of nature, are said to be religious or superstitious in the older sense. And thus, too, it is in the secluded mountain paths of Styria or the Tyrol that the frequent reappearance at every turn of crucifix, or wayside oratory, or devout picture, reminds the traveller of the simple devotion of simple men who hear the voice of God in the rolling avalanche and bend humbly beneath His outstretched hand, whether it be lifted

in mercy or in judgment. In the awful gloom of a Gothic cathedral, again, we discern, if it be through a glass darkly, the deep reverential piety of those great mediæval builders who, as Mr. Ruskin puts it, "have taken with them to the grave their powers, their honours, and their errors, but have left us their adoration." And if we turn from the religious to the political order, there too it may be argued that the old world virtue of reverence must succumb to the progressive demands of civil and religious liberty. Loyalty to the person and authority of the Sovereign was a guarantee of civil and social order in an age of absolute governments, but we have learned to substitute, in politics as in philosophy, the supremacy of law for the direct action of personal rule, and those who are ultimately the makers of law, while bound to obey, can hardly be expected to venerate, the work of their own hands. There is an obvious difference in idea between a loyal and a law-abiding people, though the practical result may in either case be much the same. And thus, alike in the religious and the secular sphere, veneration must give place to virtues better suited to our altered state. "The self-assertion of liberty, the levelling of democracy, the dissecting-knife of criticism, the economical revolutions that reduce the relations of classes to simple contracts, the agglomeration of population, and the facilities of locomotion that sever so many ancient ties, are all incompatible with the type of virtue which existed before the power of tradition was broken, and when the chastity of faith was yet sustained." And thus, to revert to Dr. Arnold's phraseology, "*Nil admirari*, the Devil's favourite text," becomes a necessity, if not a virtue, of a democratic and unromantic age like our own.

There is no doubt much plausibility in this line of argument, and it so far at least holds good that the forms, if not the essence, of veneration must vary with the changed intellectual and social conditions of the day. But for the moralist, who knows, as well from experience as on ethical grounds, that no character can be really great, or indeed be other than conspicuously defective, in which a sense of reverence is wanting, it would be difficult to grant more than this. Not only does a reverential spirit, as it has been observed, present just that form of moral goodness to which the epithet beautiful may be most justly applied, but there is a deficiency, a littleness, a priggishness, a sort of vulgarity, observable about even the highest type of moral goodness attainable without it. It is not too much to say that the man who lacks it "has lost the finest part of his nature," and it is hard to believe that any intellectual or political progress, which deserves the name, can necessarily entail so terrible a sacrifice. That a monarchical is better suited than a republican régime to foster the sentiment of loyalty may be perfectly true, and so far as it is true, affords an argument in favour of monarchy; indeed this is, we suppose, the truth underlying Dr. Johnson's well-known dictum that "the Devil was the first Whig." Nor can there be any doubt that to ordinary minds the enlargement of scientific discovery does tend, at least while it is in actual progress, to deprive natural phenomena of their moral significance, and thus to lessen religious reverence. And the marvellous rapidity of this scientific movement during the last half century, as compared with any previous period of the world's history, has given to that tendency a disproportionate and perhaps only temporary force. Yet, after all, the principle of religious veneration is no more involved in these recent discoveries than in the first suggestion of the antipodes, so startling to mediæval orthodoxy, or in the revelations of Galileo. Wordsworth speaks of religion as the "mother of form and fear, Dread arbitress of mutable respect," and the reverence she inspires need be none the less real though its expression may inevitably be varied from time to time. That sense of dependence and craving for a something higher than self to look up to and rest upon, which exists in germ in all but the most debased natures, while it is very differently developed according to character and circumstances, will not suffer itself to be defrauded of its proper satisfaction by the dominance of the ballot-box or the dissecting-knife. And if it be objected that the men of our own time, to whom we should instinctively point as typical examples of this romantic or reverential mind—men such as the late John Keble—belonged to a past or passing generation, and were out of sympathy with the spirit of the age, it is obvious to reply that this is only very partially true. Not a week has passed since a favourite pupil, and lifelong and trusted friend of Mr. Keble, was committed to the grave, who shared to the full, if any one did, his devout and reverential temper; yet the late Sir William Heathcote was at the same time, as Lord Carnarvon described him in the *Times*, the pattern of an English country gentleman and chairman of Quarter Sessions, a shrewd man of business and politician, and in the best sense of the word, a thorough man of the world. We might indeed point to the case of Arnold himself, who was suspected and denounced in his lifetime as an extreme partisan of revolutionary liberalism both in Church and State, but who nevertheless passionately protested, as we have seen, against the irreverent or "pocourantist" temper of the day, in which he detected a grave moral danger. And this strength of feeling on his part is the more remarkable, because he was an ardent reformer, and reverence is not usually the special attribute of reformers, as Mr. Hurrell Froude noted, when he roused the fierce indignation of all good Protestants by dubbing Bishop Jewell an "irreverent Dissenter." Carlyle on the other hand, however small his respect for much of the "moonshine" held in high reverence by many of his devoutest contemporaries, would have deprecated with genuine horror the charge of irreverence. He considered himself indeed the special witness and

prophet of the opposite virtue to a shallow and profane generation, though it must be allowed that he was not always happy in the particular objects he singled out to present for their veneration. And if *nil admirari* be the foundation of diabolical ethics, it may be allowed that to give honour to whom honour is not due is only less injurious to the character than to refuse to honour any but ourselves. The real danger of an age like the present, where many ancient forms of reverence seem to have become obsolete, is perhaps not so much that the value of veneration will be forgotten as that it will be misinterpreted. Goodness alone, whether human or divine, has a paramount claim on our homage, but it is quite possible, not merely to admire or covet, but to reverence power, knowledge, wealth, success, nay even successful villany. To worship a false ideal is sometimes worse, is at best only somewhat better, than worshipping none at all. And such is the instinctive craving of human nature for some actual object of veneration that the frivolous scorn or insouciance which refuses it all legitimate scope will usually be found cowering at last in the witch's cave or cringing before the golden calf.

AUTUMN IN THE HIGHLANDS.

FOR those who love a life of vicissitudes and games of chance and skill, there is nothing like a shooting lodge in the Highlands in the autumn. The skill is of course displayed in the shooting. It is true that when there is sunny weather on the opening days, the shooting is as easy as shooting can be. The coveys lie like stones in the heather, till the dogs are actually drawing into the midst of them. The old birds, sticking affectionately to their helpless offspring, defer rising till it ought to be far too late for them, offering the steadiest of marks, as they skim straight away over the moor; while the innocents flutter up in an excited flock. The veriest novice, if tolerably cool, may pick out his brace with fatal certainty; while, should he be unsportsmanlike enough to blaze into the thick of the brood, he may probably gather a shattered handful. The survivors wing a feeble flight and drop well within sight, to be followed up and slaughtered singly. The guns gain confidence as the bags fill, and there are brilliant reports for the local papers. But things are very different when the weather is wet and rough, or as the season advances. It is then that science comes in, with a great deal of quick shooting. The broods that have been shifting restlessly about the hills are keenly looking out for the approach of an enemy. The shoulder of a dog, or the head of a man, shown against the skyline over the nearest ridge, is quite enough to give them the alarm. At the best, they rise at long ranges, zigzagging like snipe as the gusts of wind catch them. Or, in the course of a week or so, they begin to pack, and then they are almost as hard to get at as wild geese. The sportsman's best chance is surprising some solitary old cock, who may fall a victim to his selfish habits, but who has an excellent notion of taking care of himself, and will carry away many pellets of shot without falling. Though the ground you are walking over may be almost overstocked, it is no easy matter getting together even half-a-dozen brace under such circumstances. Disappointment settles into something like despondency, faintly tempered by flickers of hope. As you lose faith in the probability of birds sitting within shot, you can hardly help your thoughts wandering from the business in hand; fatigue begins to tell upon the frame in the absence of sanguine excitement; and the muzzles of the gun-barrels weigh heavily on the arm, while the feet are slipping on the damp heather roots. Yet to fire with the requisite precision you must be ever in readiness; the eyes ranging keenly over the heather within gunshot, with arms and trigger-finger quick to respond to them. So much for skill, which is taxed to the uttermost; for a slow and awkward shot may as well give it up and go home. As for luck, that, as we have seen, depends chiefly on the weather, even so far as the actual contents of the bags are concerned. But big bags and much bloodshed are by no means everything; many sportsmen, and especially those in the decline of life, make shooting a secondary consideration on their annual visits to the North. There are strangers who come on visits to the lodges for the sake of the air and the magnificent scenery; and there are ladies accompanying husbands and fathers, and more passionately in love with the moors than anybody. To these hopeful holiday-makers the weather is everything, making all the difference between some weeks spent in paradise or in purgatory. We do not suppose that any rational being, with a soul for the wilder beauties of nature, would wish to have it perpetual sunshine. A cloudless day now and then is almost perfect happiness, but *tonjours soleil* would be depressing in the extreme. Were it for nothing else, the murmuring burns would be dried up, while the tiny waterfalls ceased to tumble; the heather would be scorched into a dismal uniformity of brown; the green tresses of the birch-trees would wither and droop like the broad fronds of the bracken under their shadow; and the emerald meadows in the low-lying straths would be parched into a sad harmony of colouring. We need not, however, exercise our fancy in imagining impossible horrors. There will never be any lack of water in the North, and so much the better. We could ill spare the marvellous cloud effects which are the essence of the charm of Highland scenery; and, had we not experienced the wretchedness of protracted rain, we should never rejoice as we do in the glories of the sunshine. Yet, regarding the matter philosophically as we may, none the less

do we long and pray for fine weather, especially for the occasion of our arrival at our quarters. Let us look on the one side of the picture and on the other.

It is the 11th of August, as we may assume, when, having slept in the hotel at the little town where we bid adieu to the railway, we are awakened by the boots for early breakfast. The blinds are drawn up, and through a flying shower, the sun comes streaming in at the windows. The shower is only the pride of the morning; and there is the promise, nay, the certainty, of a splendid day. We look out across the waters of the firth to the range of blue mountains, bounding the northern horizon, with their summits still swathed in wreaths of mist. The light breeze scarcely ruffles the surface of the estuary, while here and there are patches preternaturally calm. The troops of sea-fowl are swooping and screaming, and a deliciously penetrating odour comes to us from the seaweed strewn on the beach; for it is low water, and the sea shallows slowly, and a wide stretch of the sand is left bare. Delightful as are the sights and sounds and smells, it seems a sin to loiter within doors on such a morning. Breakfast is despatched, and the "machine" is at the door, drawn by a couple of sturdy Highland "garrons," that will have their work cut out for them before they drag us over the hills, with those gun-cases and portmanteaux that are roped on promiscuously. But there is no hurry, for the day is long, and we are willing to perform much of the drive at a foot's pace. Over the first part of the journey the machine makes creditable play, for the road lies on a flat between the sands and the cornfields. Then passing a little local watering-place in the bottom of a romantic glen, and crossing the bridge over the brawling salmon stream, the road begins to wind upwards through heathery hills. Yet every here and there it dips again to rejoin the banks of a river, which threads at long intervals a series of mountain lochs, alternating rushes and cataracts with stretches of calmer water, where it spreads out over the shallows. The shelving banks of many of the lochs are overhung with clusters of feathering birches; now and again we come upon a piece of oak coppice, or on the weather-beaten firs with warped limbs that have twined their knotted roots round the rocks rising abruptly out of the river. Further on and higher up the country becomes more savage. There is nothing but heather to be seen in the foreground or middle distance, except where the purple moors break away into black, watery bogs, or where you may rest the eye, by way of variety, on the smiling pastures of the strath. But on those higher hills framing the pictures on either side and before us, the heather grows thinner and thinner till it disappears in deserts of stone; and above all are peaks and broken precipices or bald scalps of slaty rock. The sun is gilding these rocks and everything else, even throwing a cheerful tinge of yellow over the peat bogs; the shadows from some floating clouds are flecking the sparkling landscape in places, and falling in grey patches on the blue lochs. As you breathe the invigorating air and are dazzled by the brilliancy of the sun glow, you appreciate all the glories of a perfect day in the Highlands. All animated nature seems as happy as your own party—the hawks and carrion crows hovering in the air; the swallows and insects skimming the water; the young broods of game basking on some bank by the roadside, and the wild ducks rising lazily from the pools, or from among the rushes by some of the burns. They seem to know that the guns are stored away in the cases and that shooting does not begin before the morrow. The lodge for which we are bound stands in a decidedly bleak situation. The only wood is a plantation of stunted larches, serving very imperfectly their purpose of a screen; and the only attempts at ornamental grounds are the gravel sweep before the entrance and a "kale yard" within walls of turf. But to-day, with the grey peat smoke curling up against the mountain in the background, and the sunbeams reflected from the lozenge window panes; with the sparrows twittering from the thatch and the ponies switching their flowing tails merrily in the paddock, it looks the very picture of homelike comfort. With a promising sunset and a high glass, you go to bed full of pleasurable hope for the morrow; and should that sort of weather continue for a week or two—occasional showers are welcome rather than otherwise—the days will glide by on downy wings, while you scarcely note the swiftness of their flight.

That is one aspect of a Highland visit, and though it is the aspect that we naturally love to dwell upon, we must glance in conscience at the other. We may cut short the description of a watery drive from the seaside, for the simple reason that next to nothing is to be seen. The firth is veiled in billowy mist, forth from which come the shrill cries of the seagull; and as the road ascends the fog thickens, while what was a dense drizzle turns into a downpour. "Water, water, everywhere!" The burns are pelting down in a brown flood, as in a broaching of bottomless vats of double stout; and the river is rapidly rising in spate. Except for the steep acclivities and sharp descents, you might as well be driving across a heath in Holland, for anything you discern of mountain scenery. You are principally occupied in adjusting your wraps, and draining off the pools that will collect about your person. The machine drags forward dismally like the forenoon; for the saturated roads make heavy travelling, and it is a sore trial for the horses' back sinews. You gather at last from certain familiar landmarks that you must be in the immediate vicinity of the lodge; but you see very little till close upon it. How small and bare it is, and how dreary it would appear were it not for certain happy associations! Doors

and windows have been tight shut, to keep out the driving rain and the damp; and when you step over the threshold into the little passage there is an odour of mingled peat and spirits and cookery and drying garments from the kitchen which opens immediately upon it. The great peat fire, crackling and sparkling on the hearth in the solitary sitting-room, is a pleasant object, and yet, as you look out through the steaming window-panes upon the watery waste beyond, your heart sinks. For you know that you may be kept a close prisoner for days, with sulky company and anxious thoughts, and, perhaps, on a starvation allowance of literature. As for your thoughts, they may well be full of care, since each stormy day as it goes by must make the grouse wilder and less approachable. So that your sport is not only being deferred, but destroyed, unless the elements should prove less unrelenting than seems likely. But it shows what the pleasures of the Highlands must be, that men should be content to pay an extravagant price for them, and yet run the risk of such periods of disappointment.

YACHT-RACING

THAT the racing of large, or, as they are commonly called, first-class yachts will come to an end before many years are over seems by no means improbable. For thinking that this may be the case there are several reasons, the first and most obvious of which is the great expense of building and maintaining a modern racer. Such a vessel, so far from being a flimsy craft, as is sometimes absurdly said, must be extremely strong unless she is to fail after a season or two. Most unwisely, as we think, neither the Clubs nor Lloyd's have attempted to put limits to lead keels; and without a heavy lead keel a yacht's chances of success in the contests of our days are small. To stand the enormous strain of such a weight very low down, a vessel must have great strength and be well put together, and in shipbuilding good work means dear work. This system of ballasting with outside lead enables a yacht to carry a huge spread of canvas, and the wear and tear on board a racing craft tell heavily on the owner's pocket. The wages usually paid are extremely high, and the very large spars are not unfrequently carried away or injured. A most expensive amusement, then, is big yacht racing, probably much more expensive than it ever has been; but, in spite of long-continued bad times and agricultural depression, there are still some rich men left in England; and, if the sport of yacht-racing were encouraged as it ought to be, no doubt a fair number of first-class vessels would be built. Unfortunately it is not, in spite of the numerous prizes that are given, encouraged as it ought to be. Clubs are, in too many cases, niggardly; and those who manage them are so shortsighted that, to save a little money, they habitually take a course which cannot fail to injure yacht-racing. The famous Rule 8 of the Yacht-Racing Association Rules provides that a yacht duly entered shall be allowed to sail over the course if there are no competitors for her. It is scarcely necessary to point out that this ordinance is a perfectly fair and just one. When an owner has had the trouble and expense of bringing his vessel to a port, of engaging his pilot and extra hands, he ought to be allowed to sail over if no antagonists are forthcoming. If a vessel is so good that no others can compete with her, she ought to be the queen of racing waters until a worthy antagonist appears. Against Rule 8, however, the Committees have steadily set their faces, being terribly afraid that their regattas would be spoilt by sails over. A few regattas might be thus spoilt; but in the long run yacht-racing, and consequently regattas, would gain by a wise liberality. How much they have been injured by the mistaken line of action which has been adopted may be easily shown by referring to what has happened with schooners. Schooner-racing has almost become a thing of the past simply because Committees regarded Rule 8 with terrified horror. Five years ago the famous and hitherto unapproached *Miranda* appeared, and in due course of time it became apparent that other schooners had little chance with her. After a while she found few competitors, and was to a considerable extent debarred from taking prizes because the Clubs would not allow sails over. No doubt a series of sails over by a schooner would have made some regattas in part very tame affairs; but is it not obvious that, if the *Miranda* had been allowed to take prizes all round the coast, a vessel would have been built to match her? The *Miranda* is an admirable yacht, undoubtedly the best schooner yet set afloat, but she would not have been allowed to reap a golden harvest during a series of seasons by placidly sailing over a variety of courses. Some yachtsman would have asked a competent naval architect to see whether he could not equal or surpass Mr. John Harvey's masterpiece. As it was, however, any one who contemplated building a racing schooner must have seen that, in the event of the *Miranda's* retiring, he would be left in a position of isolation, and accordingly no such schooner has been built, and schooner-racing has nearly come to an end. No doubt the *Miranda* is so good that she can take part in mixed races over triangular courses with some chance of success; but on such courses cutters and yawls have, generally speaking, an enormous advantage over schooners, for which the rig allowance does not adequately compensate, and, generally speaking, a two-masted vessel is hardly likely to win many flags in these contests. The unwise niggardliness of Clubs has, therefore, caused

big yachts of one kind well-nigh to disappear from racing waters. Yawls and cutters are less affected by it, as they contend on more equal terms, but if the excellent recommendation of the Yacht-Racing Association were attended to, and if class racing took the place of the mixed races, of which there have been so many lately, either the *Latona* or the *Florinda* or the *Samana* might find herself as badly off as the *Miranda*. It can hardly be disputed that class races are much better tests of the merits of vessels than mixed races; but in class races a big craft may at any time be "left out in the cold," and this fact can hardly have escaped the attention of any one who contemplated building a first class racing-yacht.

Another reason against constructing such vessels is the danger which they incur from the strange carelessness which the Clubs often show in fixing their starting lines. The evil seems to grow worse every year. Because modern yachts are remarkably handy, it seems to be thought that vessels of from ninety to a hundred and sixty tons require no more room at starting than twenties. A case of this kind occurred the other day at Southampton, and there was a collision between the *Miranda* and the mark-boat which caused serious injuries to two gentlemen belonging to the Sailing Committee of the Royal Southern Yacht Club. From the decision of the Council of the Y.R.A., which was very promptly given in this case, it seems clear that the *Miranda* was not in fault, but however much or little the *Samana*, which forced her on to the mark-boat, may have been to blame, there can be no doubt that an accident was rendered probable by the extraordinary starting line which was chosen. Now, as we have said before on this subject, men will not expose vessels worth from eight to twelve thousand pounds to the risk of great damage, and at some regattas the risk of damage is by no means small. Yachtsmen are not encouraged to build or race large yachts by finding that, in spite of the general adoption of the Y.R.A. Rules, recommendation No. 7 of the Appendix is sometimes altogether ignored.

There is another cause, however, quite independent of Clubs, which may tend to put an end to the contests of big vessels. It has lately become apparent that forties built according to the most approved principles may contend with their larger sisters with no small chance of success. This was first made evident at the race for all rigs of the Southampton Yacht Club, sailed on the 12th instant. Three first-class vessels, the *Latona*, *Miranda*, and *Samana*, contended, and ultimately the victory lay with the *Samana*; but all through the race the wonderful *Annasona* had her time well on the leading yachts, and when the *Samana* crossed the line the smaller cutter had some minutes to spare, and the *May* was within her time by a few seconds. A similar result followed in the race for the Albert Cup sailed off Southsea on the 15th instant. The prize was carried off by the *Sleuthhound*, which beat by time the *Samana*, *Latona*, and *Florinda*, the *Annasona* being disabled by an accident at the start. Now, these were two very remarkable races, but somewhat similar results have occurred before, though probably in lighter and more uncertain breezes than those which prevailed during the above matches. What happened on the 17th, at the match of the Royal Corinthian Yacht Club, in which the *Samana*, *Annasona*, and *Sleuthhound* took part, was more noteworthy. The wind was strong enough at starting to prevent the two smaller craft from carrying square-headed topsails, and freshened so much that they had to house topsails, and the *Annasona* had to take in a reef. Nevertheless, she won by time from the *Samana*, and at one period of the race actually reached faster than the larger vessel. Now this certainly was a very astonishing performance, for the *Samana*, admirable on all points of sailing, is for a cutter specially good at reaching, and moreover she is, as we need hardly say, but one year older than the *Annasona*, and represents the latest ideas respecting yacht construction. At Weymouth the *Annasona* would have won again had there been rig allowances. It really seems that, with the present scale of time allowance, a forty-ton cutter may be a most formidable rival to the first-class yachts in breezes such as in former days would have made the chance of the smaller vessels utterly hopeless. At present, no doubt, in many matches the forties cannot enter, but, if it is found that they have a considerable chance of success, a great outcry will be raised. It will be argued, not without considerable plausibility, that a restriction is maintained merely in order to keep out vessels which, if admitted, would probably be victorious, and matches from which the forties are excluded will be likened to that race for the Queen's Cup which every year forms the prominent absurdity of the Cowes week.

Many, therefore, must be the objections which present themselves to the mind of the yachtsman who thinks of building or sailing a large racing craft. There is the enormous and constantly increasing expense, and there are the further difficulties caused by the conduct of the Clubs; while apprehension must be caused by those terrible forties, which in vanquishing greatly humiliate the larger vessels. These considerations can hardly fail to tell, and the tiny racing fleet is certainly more likely to diminish than increase. It is true that an 85-ton yawl, of which report speaks highly, has been launched this season; but her appearance will not improbably cause the retirement of some other vessel, perhaps of more than one; and a new forty may be built during the winter which will prove even a greater scourge to her big sisters than the *Annasona*. On the whole, it seems far from impossible that big yacht racing may practically come to an end. The loss of the finest of sports will be a matter for regret; but it is hard to see how it can be averted with certainty, unless

expenses are diminished, unless Clubs become reasonable and liberal, and unless a new system of time allowance which shall satisfy everybody is instituted—changes not very likely soon to come about.

THE DRAIN OF GOLD.

WITHIN the past three weeks a great change has come over the London money market; the discount rate of the Bank of England was raised last week from 2½ per cent. to 3 per cent., and again on Thursday from 3 per cent. to 4 per cent.—a rise of 60 per cent. in eight days. And the outside market has followed the lead of the Bank, or rather it somewhat outstripped it, for during the first half of this week the rate in the open market was higher than the minimum of the Bank. This has been brought about by the beginning of a drain of gold to New York. To some extent, no doubt, the withdrawals of gold on Italian account contributed to the result. But these were small in themselves; and, if they had stood alone, would have had little effect. The real operative cause is the drain to New York, the magnitude and duration of which cannot be foreseen. When the great panic occurred in New York in 1873 the workmen who, under the Protectionist system, had been attracted in crowds to the large cities found themselves thrown out of employment and in danger of starving, and, to avoid the danger, were obliged to migrate to the West, where they settled upon the land, and pushed cultivation into the wilderness at a very rapid rate. They were favoured by abundant harvests. At the same time a series of exceptionally deficient harvests occurred in Europe, and gave rise to a vast demand for American food products. Thus the agricultural development of the Western regions of the United States was stimulated, first by the industrial depression, which drove hundreds of thousands of workmen from the cities to the extreme West, and, secondly, by the demand in Europe for agricultural produce. The agricultural population was greatly enriched, and their prosperity in turn gave a stimulus to trade generally. At the beginning of 1879 a new cause came into operation, which imparted a fresh impetus to the revival that had already set in. This was the resumption of specie payments. Since then the prosperity has gone on increasing until, perhaps, the world has never seen so large a population in such universal enjoyment of well-being. The great activity of trade generated has naturally required a much larger volume of money in circulation than previously sufficed. The immense harvests needed more labour, and the demand for labour, of course, sent up wages. At the same time the movement of the crops from the West to the Atlantic seaboard compelled the railways to employ larger numbers of servants, to run more trains—in a word, to increase the accommodation they gave the public. In like manner, the canals and river steamboat Companies, the dealers in grain and pork and cattle, the wharfingers, and, in short, all engaged in the trade, had to employ additional labour at higher wages. The cessation of famine in India just then also restored prosperity to the cotton industry, and consequently augmented the demand for American cotton. In addition to all this, the construction of railways, suspended since the panic of 1873, was resumed with greater activity than before. The growth of population, the increase in the area under cultivation, the rise of new cities, the settlement of new territories, and the accumulation of wealth, rendered necessary additional railway accommodation, and the American people threw themselves into the work with their usual feverish activity. It is estimated, for instance, that in the current year not less than ten thousand miles will be added to the railway system of the United States. The rise of wages which we have been tracing brought with it a rise of prices. And, furthermore, for some time there has been great speculative activity in the stock markets, such as we have witnessed here at home. In all these ways there has been a vastly increased demand for money. Every employer of labour has had to pay, not only more workmen, but higher wages to each; and, although the banking system of the United States is highly developed, and banking accommodation extends even to the new Territories, the banking legislation of the United States does not favour the expansion of the bank-note circulation, and thus coin has had to fill up the place not occupied by paper. According to a return just furnished by Mr. Knox, the Comptroller of the currency of the United States, the circulation of the United States at present amounts to no less than 286,102,170*l.*, of which 104 millions sterling are in gold and about 34½ millions sterling in silver coin. Nearly the whole of the metallic currency, in the aggregate, as we see, almost 138½ millions sterling, has been added to the circulation since the beginning of 1879. Previously to that year, as our readers will remember, the money of the United States consisted for eighteen years of inconvertible paper. Soon after the Resumption Act was passed in 1875, the Secretary of the Treasury set about accumulating gold to serve as a reserve when resumption should be carried out; and therefore for about six years the whole produce of the gold mines of the United States has been retained in the country. At the same time there has been taken from Europe during the past two years about 35 millions sterling in gold, while, since the passing of the Bland Act, the greater part of the silver production of the United States has also been retained at home.

It would have seemed probable that this enormous increase of

the currency would have sufficed for all the needs of the United States, although it is true that in the past ten years over 10 millions have been added to the population, and emigrants are pouring into the country at the rate of nearly two thousand a day. It seems, however, that the inflation of prices has gone on even more rapidly than the addition to the currency, and that still more money is wanted. Accordingly, the drain which we witnessed last autumn and in the autumn before has again set in, and during the past fortnight about 2½ millions sterling in gold have been shipped from London, Paris, and Amsterdam to the United States. According to all appearance, too, the drain is likely to go on for a considerable time longer. To some extent this demand for gold in the United States is being caused by the attack upon the President's life. It will be recollected that in the spring Mr. Windom, the Secretary of the Treasury, succeeded in refunding the Five and Six per Cent. Bonds falling due this year at the reduced rate of 3½ per cent., and he decided to pay off out of the surplus revenue accumulated in the Treasury about 19 millions sterling of these bonds. A portion of these were called in and paid off in July, and another portion in the early part of the current month, but the rest do not fall due till the 1st of October. Mr. Windom has felt himself bound to keep in the Treasury enough of gold to pay off the holders of these bonds, should they present them at the beginning of October. Had the President been in good health, there is little doubt that, when the stringency in the money market of New York set in, he would have authorized the Secretary of the Treasury to offer to redeem the whole of the bonds at once, with the object of relieving the money market. But during the illness of the President it is not possible to call together a Cabinet Council, and without authorization from the President or from the Cabinet, Mr. Windom long hesitated to take the step which he must have seen was advisable. At length, however, he has decided to pay off without rebate the holders of Five per Cent. Bonds falling due on the 1st of October. It is too soon yet to know how far this decision will affect the money market. The holders of the bonds are not always those who want money, or who can employ it to the most advantage in the short loan market. Many of them may therefore prefer to keep their bonds, receiving up to the 1st of October the full interest at the rate of 5 per cent. per annum; consequently it may be that the relief to the market will not be as great as at first sight it promises to be. Still, the offer in itself will have a reassuring effect. Some of the holders may reasonably be expected to take their money and surrender their bonds, and the money which is paid out of the Treasury will help to relieve the market. It would further appear that just now the consumption of commodities in the United States is enormously increasing. During the past three weeks, for instance, gold has been withdrawn from the New York Associated Banks at the rate of about 940,000*l.* a week, making a total withdrawal of about 2,820,000*l.* in the three weeks. In the corresponding three weeks of last year the amount so withdrawn but little exceeded 800,000*l.*, and in the corresponding weeks of 1879 the amount was only about 650,000*l.* As it is much more convenient and much cheaper to remit paper than to remit gold when the purpose is to make payments in the interior of the Union, it is probable that these large withdrawals were not intended for remittance to the West or South, but to a large extent were for the purpose of paying Customs duties on goods which were previously warehoused, and which are now going into consumption. If this be so, it is clear that, were the President in good health, he would take steps to pay out the coin which is locked up idle in the Treasury. At present it is as absolutely out of the reach of the money market as if it were sent out of the country. Last year and the year before Mr. Sherman relieved the market by large purchases for the Sinking Fund. But at that time the President was in good health and Cabinet Councils could be constantly held, whereas now whatever step Mr. Windom takes he has to take on his own responsibility. As he is new to office, it is natural he should not like to risk unusual responsibility, especially as large claims for the redemption of bonds will come upon him on the 1st of October.

As to the probable amount and continuance of the drain, we are inclined to think that it will be considerably smaller than in the past two years. Both last autumn and the autumn before the withdrawals exceeded 15 millions sterling. But we are inclined to think that in the present autumn little more than half that amount will be taken. One of our reasons for this opinion is the enormous increase of the currency of the United States, which we have shown above. In two years and eight months the total amount of cash in the country has been nearly doubled. It is in the highest degree improbable, therefore, that very much more money can be needed for the purposes of trade. Another reason we have for our opinion is the large amount of money which the Secretary of the Treasury is bound to pay out within the next couple of months. As we have been showing above, the stringency in the New York market is partly caused, or, at least, is aggravated, by the large payments of gold out of the banks into the Treasury, the money so paid in being there kept, locked up and idle. But the Secretary has still to redeem in the course of the autumn about eight millions sterling of debt. The letting out of so large a sum must relieve the market, and, therefore, render unnecessary such immense imports from Europe as took place during the past two years. Furthermore, we are inclined to hope that, instead of taking gold this autumn, the Americans will, to some extent at least, rather take goods from this country. As we have been pointing out, the consumption of goods in the United States is very large at present and seems to be

increasing rapidly. If the money market does not become so dear as to injuriously affect trade, this demand will increase, prices will rise, not improbably until they reach the level which will admit of considerable imports from this country. The enormous construction of railways, to which we have already referred, is necessarily raising the price of iron and steel, and we hope to see before the year is out a considerable demand for British steel and iron. Moreover, it is to be borne in mind that the debt due from Europe to the United States will not be as much this year as it has been during the past two years. The American harvest is not as abundant this year as for some years past, while European harvests are better. Unfortunately, the weather we are now having is injuriously affecting our own harvest; but, in any case, Europe will have larger supplies than it has had for some years back. Therefore, it is to be assumed that the debt due from this country to the United States will be less, and consequently that the United States will not have the same power of taking gold from us. Lastly, if the drain of gold should continue, and should make money dear in London, it may be taken for granted that the export of gold to the United States would be stopped. There would be no profit in taking gold from a dear market to send it at a considerable cost to another market where it would not give a larger profit.

THE THEATRES.

THE new play, *Sedgemoor*, by Messrs. W. G. and F. C. Wills, given at Sadler's Wells on the 20th, is very properly divided into four acts. As it really consists of two quite distinct plots, each of which has a half of the play to itself, the equal division makes it easy for the critic, and perhaps at some future time may make it convenient for the authors, to reduce it to its natural elements. By the addition of a few lines the first half might be made into a melodrama complete in itself. The second half might then be made into a comedy of intrigue by the somewhat longer process of making the characters probable and the dialogue natural. As it is, the two are essentially independent of one another, though artlessly tagged together, and the characters are mere mouthpieces for the sort of humour and sentiment which was thought likely to appeal to the pit and gallery of Sadler's Wells. As the piece stands, the first is by much the better of the two parts. It is not that the melodramatic incidents possess the merit of originality, for every one of them has been drawn from that fund of recognized stage effects which is the common property of all playwrights; but they are combined with a certain dexterity, and, helped by a little good nature on the part of the audience, make a very tolerable whole. A Somersetshire gentleman, of the name of Sir Gilbert Evelyn, has taken the convenient opportunity of Monmouth's revolt to be absent from home without informing his wife of what he is doing. Before his return Monmouth reaches his house wounded and flying in disguise, and persuades Lady Evelyn to hide him, under promise that he will leave as soon as the husband returns. Scarcely is he safe in the cupboard, which has hidden so many inconvenient people on the stage, before Sir Evelyn does come back and gives his wife, or rather the gallery, a very high-flown account of the battle—so called—of *Sedgemoor*. His narrative is adorned with many contemptuous speeches about Monmouth. Lady Evelyn is engaged in persuading her husband to leave the house when a party of soldiers, under command of Sir Gilbert's old friend, Colonel James O'Brien—a comic Irishman with a song—arrive and propose to search. On the assurance of Lady Evelyn, an assurance that Monmouth is not there, given after a delay that should have aroused the Colonel's suspicions at once, the King's officer weakly agrees to make no search. But Lady Evelyn's son betrays the secret by calling attention to a stain of blood on the ground where it has fallen from Monmouth's wound. The concealed rebel is discovered. Sir Gilbert, like so many husbands in melodrama, takes his wife's fault on himself, and is consequently handed over to the tender mercies of Jeffreys. Here ends the first act, with an effective "curtain." The action of the second passes at Court at Whitehall, and begins already to wander somewhat from the directness of the first. Various historical characters are introduced under strange disguises. Mary of Modena, who made such a good thing out of selling the rebels to the planters in Barbadoes, appears as a sovereign full of tender compassion; Father Petre, more appropriately as the wily Jesuit of tradition; Catherine Sedley, as the young and beautiful mistress of the King, to the ineffable surprise of Sir Gilbert Evelyn, who must have been strangely innocent for an ex-guardian of those days; and, most wonderful of all, Sunderland, as an empty-headed fop. All these persons engage for different motives; Sunderland, because he wishes to seduce Lady Evelyn; Catherine, because she loves Sir Gilbert; Father Petre and the Queen, because they wish to ruin Catherine, in attempting to save Evelyn. But, in reality, they have nothing to do with it, and are there only to supply the "germs" for the third and fourth acts. Sir Gilbert is saved by the extraordinary skill of Lady Evelyn in cross-examining Monmouth, who is made to confess in that last interview of his with his uncle, that it was she who hid him.

We confess our inability to follow the story from this point. The stream of the plot branches out into a species of delta. The intrigues of Petre, of Catherine Sedley, and of Sunderland keep on clashing together till the arrival of the Prince of Orange puts an end to the play. Sir Gilbert Evelyn, who is a greater fool

than any of Wycherley's country husbands, is persuaded that his wife is false. He lives with the King's mistress without the King's knowledge, intrigues with the Prince of Orange while remaining a friend of the loyal Colonel O'Brien, is condemned to death without trial for each of these offences, repents of his misconduct to his wife, and is saved in the nick of time.

As, at least in part, the work of one of the few writers who are supposed to prove that the dramatic literature of England is not quite dead, *Sedgemoor* should be entitled to be judged as literature. But, as far as it proves anything, it is that the playwright of to-day considers that his craft privileges him to neglect both style and character. If he combines a certain number of situations into a more or less coherent story, so as to put the strong ones at the ends of the acts, that is enough. That the *dramatis persona* should have some approach to reality, and that their talk should be in the English of this or any other time, is apparently not thought necessary. The dramatist may deal as he pleases with the mere facts of history, and we care very little that Mr. Wills makes Monmouth say that his death will leave his father childless; nor is it any great matter that intriguing with a king's mistress is represented here as a sort of high treason, and that the articles of war are supposed to be in force in James's army. But the characters and the language of a time are not to be played with. No novelist would be pardoned for making an empty fribble of Sunderland; and, if he ventured to introduce Catherine Sedley, he would be held to be bound to invent some wit for her, though, historically speaking, he might be excused from making her beautiful. But Mr. Wills has no scruple about dubbing two mere dummies with these well-known names. As for the English of the play, it belongs to no period whatever, being merely Mr. Wills's variation on the sham Elizabethan style of Sheridan Knowles. With an abundant literature at their hand to show them how the English of 1688 talked, the authors of *Sedgemoor* make their personages use the wonderful conventional style of Knowles's "poetic drama," which is on a par with that of the historical novels published weekly with illustrations for the benefit of ingenuous youth. Messrs. Wills are so overpowered by the necessity of being poetical, that they cannot let Lady Evelyn talk about the avenue to her maid without calling it "yon vista of ancient elms." Sir Gilbert swears "by the rood," and all the rest of the conversation walks on the same high stilts. Of the rendering of the parts it is not necessary to say anything, except that it is a fine specimen of the kind of acting in which a violent pose and a loud voice express all and every emotion.

Claude Duval: or, Love and Larceny, was obviously composed to give the largest possible number of young persons, in very short dresses of more or less crude colours, the greatest possible number of opportunities to troop on and off the stage of the Olympic. The piece, which is described as "A New and Original Romantic and Comic Opera," is, however, no doubt also intended to have a plot. There is a story—a series of incidents which follow one another without much apparent connexion, and which in succession give occasion for a song and the appearance of the young persons aforesaid. Claude Duval's band capture one Charles Lorrimore, who is flying from a prosecution for high treason for the crime of being an adherent of Lord Clarendon's. The capture is a fortunate thing for Lorrimore, for Claude Duval turns out to be his friend, Sir Harry Villebois, with whom he has "ruffled it" in town. The friendly highwayman at once puts himself and band at Lorrimore's disposal to secure his escape, and obtain for him his lady love Constance, niece to one McGruder, a Puritan of the regular stage type, whom the fortune of war has put in possession of Lorrimore's family estate. By the most fortunate chance in the world, Duval is engaged in a scheme to rob McGruder. From this convenient beginning the events follow their natural course. The robbers go to McGruder's, or rather Lorrimore's, estate of Mildon Manor, and soldiers come after, not them, but the fugitive lover—how directed does not appear, but very conveniently for the production of situations. They are accordingly produced. The generous Claude very unnecessarily allows himself to be captured in Lorrimore's place. Of course he escapes, also of course the robbery of Mildon Hall brings about the discovery of title-deeds which put Lorrimore again in possession of the home of his ancestors, a pardon arrives just at the right moment, and all ends happily.

The thread of this not very remarkable story is spun out by various incidents. McGruder, his sister, and niece are captured by the robber gang in the first act to afford a chance for a very indifferent copy of what the playwright, perhaps ironically, calls one of Mr. Frith's "wonderful" pictures. A great deal of time is occupied by McGruder's sister, Mistress Betty, who is that theatrically useful character a middle-aged coquette, subdued by the "new and original flattery" of being told she might be her niece's sister. The choruses and songs, all to airs which sound very much like an echo of some one passage of Offenbach's music, take up a certain amount of time. But the predominating feature of the piece is the chorus of "village maidens" in the short dresses. They keep coming on at every moment, standing aimlessly round the other characters, or going through a series of constrained swayings of the body called "incidental dances." The actors loyally did their best for the jets of the piece. They paused before them to attract attention, and then brought them out like pistol shots; but, in spite of their efforts, Mr. Stephens's puns were very dreary. The performers seemed to suffer from a depressing sense that no exertions of theirs could infuse life into their parts or music, and that was perhaps

the efficient cause of the flatness of their acting and singing. Not even the horse on which Claude Duval rode on to the stage could atone for the continual presence of Joe Miller and the disguised ghost of Offenbach who are, between them, the real authors of the piece which bears the name of Messrs. Stephens and Solomon.

REVIEWS.

BREWER'S ENGLISH STUDIES.*

THIS collection of the late Mr. Brewer's minor works—for the main part of his work, we need hardly say, must be sought in the publications of the Record Office—will be welcomed by all English students who believe enough in their own language, history, and letters to think them worth taking seriously. Those who expect essays to be amusing, in the nineteenth-century sense of the word, will indeed scarcely be satisfied by this volume, though it has precisely that kind of interest for cultivated readers which our fathers of a century ago did call amusement. Mr. Brewer's historical judgments may cause graver searchings of heart in some quarters. His consummate knowledge of the facts and materials of English history is beyond dispute. But it is easy to see that he was in no wise in sympathy with the school of which our chief living historians stand at the head, whose method and results have been popularized by Mr. Green's *Short History*, and which is followed by a great majority of recent writers on the subject. We cannot find that Mr. Brewer ever openly broke a lance with Mr. Freeman or Professor Stubbs; but he fell upon Mr. Green in the *Quarterly Review* with something like a furious joy of battle. It is not our purpose to discuss the merits of either this controversy or the unsparing criticism of Macaulay, not the less pointed for not being always express, which runs through the essay on the Stuarts. We can only remark in a general way that Mr. Brewer shows now and then at least sufficient bias to counteract that of the Whig historians whom he censures; and that, when he endeavoured to reduce that lamented and ill-used monarch James II. to nothing worse than a well-meaning and respectable bore (but such a bore that it was a positive virtue in Charles II. to endure him), Mr. Brewer must have for the moment forgotten the existence and contents of a document of some historical and constitutional importance which must have been not unknown to him—we mean the Bill of Rights. But all this may not unnaturally be disheartening to a young reader. He may say to himself, "Here have I been all this time learning history from the most approved masters, and on what I was given to understand was the latest scientific method. I am well up in the *Norman Conquest*, and the *Constitutional History*, and the *Select Charters*, to say nothing of essays and minor works of my masters like the *Growth of the English Constitution*. And here is an equally learned person, who has passed a lifetime in original historical work, and tells me it is all wrong. Here are the latest doctors disagreeing over the Stuarts, just as people did when the Jacobites had barely ceased to count in practical politics. Is not this new scientific study of history altogether vanity? The old-fashioned sort of history was less troublesome, and, after all, not much less true."

After some such manner we may conceive an ingenious young man to commune with himself; and we can conceive that, unless his teachers have been careful to mark the limits of what they could teach, his soul may be disquieted for a season. If he has been taught dogmatically to accept the results of a real master's work at second or third hand without entering into the master's evidences and reasons, his faith will probably be shaken, and it is quite right that it should be. If, on the other hand, he has been taught to verify and encouraged to criticize, he will know that the business of history is to give the truest account that can be attained of human actions and motives, not to supersede individual judgment of them. So long as men differ in their opinions of the public men and affairs of their own time, so long will they also differ as to the public men and affairs of the past, nor will any possible completion of our knowledge prevent them from differing. It is true that we know many things which the actors in a great historical crisis could not know as we do. The counsels of both sides, the confidences of statesmen, the reports of indifferent observers, or of foreigners intent on purposes distinct from those of either contending party, lie open to us. But, on the other hand, the actors knew much that we do not know, nor can we see things as they saw them. It is almost impossible for an English lawyer, looking back two centuries and a half, with the Bill of Rights and the Act of Settlement between, to realize how the legal disputes of the Crown and the Commons under the first two Stuarts would have appeared at the time to a judge really anxious to be impartial. The same causes which lead men to take sides on questions of their own time, where the material facts are notorious or easily ascertained, will lead them to do the like as to questions of past history. Learning will save a man from being a blind partisan—from defending, for example, an impossible version of facts which may once have been current—but

* *English Studies; or, Essays in English History and Literature*. By the late J. S. Brewer, M.A., &c. Edited, with a Prefatory Memoir, by Henry Wace, M.A., &c. London: John Murray. 1881.

it will not hinder him from adhering to one party more than the other. It is easier to be judicial as to past events, not so much because we are better informed, or because our feelings are less affected by them, as because there is no immediate pressure on us to make up our mind. The moral and political interpretation of facts remains a matter for each man's moral and political temper; it cannot be reduced to a possession of positive knowledge. In short, the less we find in the antagonism of the late Mr. Brewer to other leaders in English historical study—we may as well avow for our part that they are *nostra schola auctores*—is that both those who are misguided enough to teach opinion instead of fact, and those who are unfortunate enough to learn it, are exposed to considerable discomfiture sooner or later.

Leaving the more or less debatable ground of the essays dealing with controversial politics, we turn to the other features of Mr. Brewer's work. Under the title of "New Sources of English History," there is a most interesting account of the Record Office and its contents; a subject on which no one was able to speak with fuller knowledge than Mr. Brewer. The following passage may be taken as a representative one:—

The collection is enormous. Into this vast receptacle the Law Courts, the Treasury, the Admiralty, the War Office, the Home, Foreign, and Colonial Departments, have disgorged their voluminous contents. The public acts of this nation, from the Domesday of William the Conqueror to the Coronation Oath of Queen Victoria, the pulsations of the great machine of government, with all its complex operations, are here chronicled and recorded in all their immense variety from day to day and from hour to hour. Here is to be traced the open and the secret history of the nation; its transactions at home and abroad; its most subtle and mysterious negotiations; the employment of its treasures; the number and disposition of its forces; the musters of its population; the distribution of its land, its forests, and its manors; the rise and progress of its nobility and great families; its proceedings in Parliament; its charters, its patents, its civil and criminal judicature. Whatever, in short, this kingdom has for eight centuries done or proposed to do by the complicated functions of its Government and Administration, restless as the sea and multitudinous as the sands upon its shore, is here committed to safe, silent, and impartial witnesses. Stored up in iron gratings, classified and arranged, preserved, as far as human skill can preserve them, from innumerable perils, the public records of this kingdom now slumber in their new repository of stone and iron undisturbed except when removed from their shelves to gratify the curiosity of the antiquarian or assist the researches of the historian.

With materials so vast, yet so important, two questions have perpetually arisen from early times: first, how are they to be most efficiently preserved? and next, how turned to the best account? Happily the nation has suffered little from foreign invasions. Such misfortunes as have overtaken Strasburg, and destroyed its libraries and its manuscripts, are comparatively unknown here. Even in the Civil Wars of the fifteenth century, and in the Great Rebellion of the seventeenth, though the rage of party might dismantle or destroy mansions, monasteries, and cathedrals, it left unimpaired the national monuments. Whether Romanist or Protestant, Cavalier or Roundhead, gained the ascendancy, all alike in turn respected the archives of the kingdom, and preserved them from sacrilegious violence. Their worst enemies have been of an ignoble kind—rats and mice, fire, damp, and mildew: the negligence in some instances, the misplaced confidence in others, of those who were appointed to preserve them. Dispersed in various quarters of the metropolis, some at the Tower, some at Carlton House, some in the Chapter House at Westminster, others at the Rolls House; exposed to weather, dust, and smoke; stowed away in sacks, boxes, and hampers; unmanageable from their vastness and unwieldiness; little known, and therefore attracting little attention—successive Governments were contented to believe that these monuments were in some sense preserved, and equally contented that they should be of no use to any one.

The explanation of the peculiar social and personal interest of the State Papers of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries is also worth citing. In those times "it was the custom of the Government of this country to confiscate all the letters and papers of attainted persons, without distinction. Thus it was that the diaries, the household accounts, the private correspondence of the accused were transferred to the Exchequer, and there they remain to the present day." The principles on which the Calendars of State Papers have been arranged and edited are fully explained in the course of the essay. A still more interesting essay, perhaps, is that on Hatfield House. Details are given, partly from papers in the Record Office, partly from MSS. preserved at the house itself, of its building under Robert Cecil's direction; and from this Mr. Brewer passes on to the political correspondence in the same collection—"a visible and material bond that brings the present, by undying sympathy, into close proximity with the past"—and proceeds to a spirited and closely-reasoned vindication of Cecil's character and policy, particularly as concerning his dealings with Essex, whose misfortunes were brought upon him, as Mr. Brewer contends, almost entirely by his own want of "a little temper and a small modicum of discretion." The romance of the Queen's ring and the Countess of Nottingham is dismissed as altogether incredible, both from its intrinsic difficulties and from the lateness of its first appearance. By the way, a ring purporting to be the identical one in question was exhibited to the Archaeological Congress at Bedford the other day. "The bricks are there to testify it, therefore deny it not."

In the essay on Shakespeare, followed by a more popular lecture on the study of Shakespeare, Mr. Brewer goes into various matters in which, though what he puts forward is often striking and generally sound, his mastery is less assured than in the strictly historical field. One fact of some importance unknown to the Shakespeare commentators is brought to light by the aid of unpublished papers in the Record Office—namely, that the Lucys of Charleote were not merely private enemies of Shakespeare on account of his deer-stealing, but had a standing feud with the men of Stratford. With regard to the supposition that Shakspeare

spent much of his time in patching up other people's plays, which had already been broached when Mr. Brewer first published this essay ten years ago, and has since waxed to a monstrous growth under the care of the "New Shakspeare Society," it is pointed out in a note that, considering the rapidity with which Shakspeare's undoubted work was produced, it is incredible that he should have had time or occasion to do anything of the kind. In the lecture (originally delivered to the Shakspeare Reading Society at King's College, London) consideration of the advantages to be derived from reading Shakspeare aloud leads to a digression of two or three pages on "the singular indifference with which the human voice has been treated" in modern English education. Mr. Brewer complains that those who do profess to teach elocution attend too much to emphasis and too little to modulation, which is likely enough to be true. He even suggests that it is a defect in modern languages that they need emphasis at all. In Greek it was sufficiently marked by the relative position of words in the sentence, and the speaker had nothing but modulation to think of. And in our own day, we may add, any one who attends to good French speaking or recitation will hear that a Frenchman, as a rule, has much more of modulation at command than an Englishman, and relies much less on emphasizing particular words. But there is no reason for treating emphasis and modulation as natural enemies, which Mr. Brewer almost does. Still less can we follow the learned author in a note appended to this lecture, where he finds a new and profound moral significance in *Romeo and Juliet*, holding that Shakspeare's true intention in that play was to expound a social and religious theory of wedded love. However, every writer on Shakspeare is entitled to at least one paradox.

The essay on the Royal Supremacy brings us back to historical ground. It is less extensive than its title would naturally import, being in truth a demolition of Mr. Froude's apotheosis of Thomas Cromwell. In "Passages from the Life of Erasmus" we have a sketch of Erasmus's work in New Testament criticism. The difficulties of a sixteenth-century scholar are vividly brought before us by Erasmus's journeyings. He had once to go with great reluctance, and at great inconvenience, from Brussels to Basel, facing the three things he detested in Germany—the stoves, the thieves, and the plague—to get his Greek Testament printed, because there was no fount of Greek type in the Low Countries. A lecture on the study of history, delivered by Mr. Brewer at the Working Men's College, is rather disappointing; it contains over-coloured statements of the race-theory of history which Mr. Brewer would hardly have cared to defend in more finished work. On the other hand, the lecture on the study of English history which immediately follows it is very good. Mr. Brewer's advice to people who really want to learn the history of England is to construct their history for themselves before they read systematic books at all; and he points out how it can be done to good purpose without using any but the most easily accessible materials. The advice was given to working men; but we think schoolmasters who wish to train their pupils' mind and judgment, and not merely stuff their memory, may find in this lecture of Mr. Brewer's some profitable hints for their teaching. We cannot repeat the details here; but the principle is to mark down the leading and undisputed facts, have them always at hand, and think over them for oneself. "Take care of the great facts," said Mr. Brewer, "and they will take care of the little ones"—a saying as true as it is full of comfort for the unlearned, with which we may fitly close this notice of a learned man's remains.

IONIAN ANTIQUITIES.*

THE fourth volume of the *Ionian Antiquities*, which follows its last predecessor after an interval of forty years, contains a fuller account, for which the expedition of Mr. R. P. Pullan has furnished materials, of those temples in Priene Teos and the Troad which have for so many years occupied the attention and consumed the funds of the Society of Dilettanti. This new volume must be regarded in close connexion with those which preceded it, and of which it is the complement, possibly the last chapter; and we must judge it in this light. From the first the excavations and the publications of the Society of Dilettanti have had a character peculiar to themselves; and we therefore prefer, before speaking of the book which is our immediate subject, to say a few words as to the history of the Society which brings it out. And we do so the more readily because the Society of Dilettanti is not one which chooses to thrust itself into notoriety, but is content to do good work slowly and unostentatiously, after the fashion of bygone times.

The Society was founded in 1734 by some gentlemen who had travelled in Italy, and was intended to be at once a social club and to operate for the encouragement at home of those artistic tastes which had given the members so much enjoyment abroad. A bias towards dining has always marked the Society; and, when we look over the names of the early members, we may judge that the high thinking encouraged by it was not accompanied by plain living. But in a few years a disease crept into the Society, and, as often happens in the case of individuals, stimulated it to take exercise. This disease was nothing less than a plethora of money. In 1764 the members,

* *Ionian Antiquities*. Vol. IV. Published by the Society of Dilettanti. London: Macmillan & Co. 1881.

after proposing various plans for disposing of their superfluous funds, resolved to send "a person or persons to certain parts of the East to collect informations relative to the former state of those countries," and in particular to procure exact descriptions of ruins. The party sent out consisted of Chandler, Revett, and Pars, and the expedition had very valuable results. Pars in particular, being a young draughtsman full of talent and energy, did good work. At Athens he had himself slung aloft close to the frieze of the Parthenon, to the great disgust of the Turks dwelling on the Acropolis, whose inmost recesses he overlooked from his lofty station. There he made exact drawings of the Panathenaic frieze, which are still of great value to the archaeologist. From Athens the party went on to Ionia, and there discovered in the temples of Teos and Priene a field for the activities of the Society which had sent them out, as well as materials for the first volume of *Ionian Antiquities*, which made its appearance in 1769. This publication seems to have given a bent to the hitherto somewhat random efforts of the Dilettanti. Henceforward they took as their province Attica and Ionia, and in those districts mainly confined their attention to the remains of ancient temples. It is true that, though from the sumptuous plates with which the huge folios of the *Ionian Antiquities* are so liberally provided we may gather information as to the schemes of ancient cities, their theatres, agoras, and gymnasia, nevertheless the chief attention of the editors has always been concentrated on the religious buildings.

In 1812 took place the second expedition equipped by the Society, the party consisting of Gell, the "rapid Gell" of Byron, and the architects Gandy and Bedford. The results of their researches in Attica and on the Ionic coast were given to the world by the Dilettanti in two splendid works—the *Antiquities of Attica*, and the second and third volumes of *Ionian Antiquities*. At about the same time they also published two volumes of plates of ancient statues in public and private collections in England, prefaced by dissertations by Richard Payne Knight on the history and meaning of ancient sculpture. And at a somewhat later time (1851) they brought out, in a style worthy of it, the beautiful and complete work of Penrose on the *Principles of Athenian Architecture*.

The third expedition of the Society was sent out in 1862, under the direction of Mr. R. P. Pullan, who made excavations and researches at Teos in 1862, and in 1866 at Priene, on the site of the temple of Athene Polias, and on that of the Temple of Apollo Smithius near Hamaxitis in the Troad. The task set before Mr. Pullan was the more complete examination of the same temples which had been before visited by the agents of the Dilettanti, an examination carried on alike with spade, measure, and pencil. As an excavator Mr. Pullan at Priene was not brilliantly successful, although many important inscriptions and some sculptures of value have been recovered, and liberally presented by the Dilettanti to the national collection. But as an exact and careful investigator, both at Priene and elsewhere, he has merited the highest praise.

The recently-published volume contains a number of plates and woodcuts, the latter mostly from photographs of sculpture, the former from drawings by Mr. Pullan and Mr. Falkener. These plates furnish the architect with every detail which can be ascertained in regard to the three Ionian temples investigated. The text includes, besides Mr. Pullan's report of excavations, a paper by Mr. J. Fergusson on the origin of the Greek orders of architecture, short histories of Priene and Teos by Mr. C. T. Newton, a memoir on the proportions of the several temples by Mr. Watkins Lloyd, and a paper by Mr. Penrose on the entasis and height of the columns of the temple at Priene.

On the first page of the work, in the preface, we notice two considerable inaccuracies. The expedition of Chandler is assigned to the year 1734 instead of 1764; and the second volume of *Ionian Antiquities*, published in 1797, is said to be the outcome of Gell's expedition of 1812. Mr. Fergusson's dissertation, which comes next, would require for satisfactory discussion more space than we can spare. We confess that a bold piece of theorizing seems to us oddly out of place in a monumental volume and on a folio page. We are so used to reading sweeping statements and novel imaginations in an octavo that there they do not shock us; but there is something so solemn about the vastness of these folios—such a deliberate intention about them of lasting for all generations, and looking fresh a century hence—that we cannot help wondering at Mr. Fergusson's boldness in choosing such a vehicle for his theories. Not that we are disposed to quarrel with them in the main, however we may object to a passage here and there, more particularly perhaps to the foot-notes. Mr. Fergusson maintains an entirely Egyptian origin for the Doric order of architecture, and treats with summary contempt the views of those who suppose that it arose out of wooden construction. And certainly the argument on which he most relies—the progressive attenuation of the Doric pillar in the course of Greek architectural history—does seem to show that the original which first suggested it was of rock or brick rather than of wood. Nevertheless there are in Doric construction certain reminiscences and traces of wooden architecture which require a more careful explanation than Mr. Fergusson is disposed to give them. As to the derivation of the Ionic order we more readily agree with him.

Mr. Newton's historical sketches are, as a matter of course, thoroughly good and scholarly. To his dissertation on Priene a charming bit of historical colouring is lent by the account of the discovery of the coins of King Orophernes. It appears that in 1870 Mr. Clarke was at Priene, and visited the site of the Temple of Athene. As he stood amid the stones of the base whereon the

colossal statue of the goddess had stood, stones dragged out of position by Greek masons in their Vandalic ravages of the site, he saw on the ground a coin which turned out to bear the portrait (and a wonderfully fine portrait) and the types of Orophernes. On searching he found other coins of the same king, all placed under the stones of the base itself. Now it seems from this probable that King Orophernes dedicated the statue of Athene erected on the base. Turning to history, we find it recorded that Orophernes was a claimant of the throne of the kingdom of Cappadocia about B.C. 160, and that he deposited a sum of 400 talents with the people of Priene—a trust which they kept with a fidelity unusual in antiquity, choosing rather to incur a war with Ariarathes, who was then actual ruler of Cappadocia, than to give up to him the treasure. History tells us that the Prienians at last restored the deposit to Orophernes himself, but does not tell us what reward they received for their honesty. But this silence of history is filled by the testimony of a handful of coins, which show that the Cappadocian in gratitude presented to the people of Priene and their goddess, in whose temple the money had very likely been kept, a colossal statue of the Deity herself. Little discoveries like this help wonderfully to give vividness to ancient history. It is also interesting to note that, according to the testimony of Pausanias, the colossal statue of Athene Polias at Priene was an admirable work of art; for this proves that artists of Asia Minor were capable in the middle of the second century B.C., a time usually supposed to have been one of great artistic barrenness and degradation, of producing a colossal statue which won continued admiration even in the critical days of the Antonines, when there was so strong a prejudice in favour of what was archaic in art. After well weighing this fact, we shall be less astounded at the beauty of the Pergamene sculptures recently acquired by the Museum of Berlin.

The remaining chapters, which mainly consist of dissertations on proportions in Greek temple-architecture, we must leave to the judgment of the few who have specially studied such matters. An examination of Greek temple-building finally resolves itself into somewhat complicated arithmetical computations. Unfortunately, in the case of these Ionian temples the data are to a large extent wanting, many important members of all having entirely disappeared, so that the results of Mr. Lloyd's calculations can at best be only approximative. It is, moreover, noteworthy that canons of proportion are not so closely observed and followed by the architects of these Asiatic temples as by those who planned the Athenian masterpieces.

On the whole one cannot but be proud, from a national point of view, of the publications of the Society of Dilettanti. A club of private English gentlemen, they have produced works which, in completeness and in costliness, deserve to stand by the side of the state-aided publications of foreign countries, even those of Russia. Although the main object of the Society has always been of a social character, it has enrolled among its members some of the best names in classical archaeology of past days, and quite recently has received into its circle some of our ablest younger Grecians. If it is now disposed to continue its activity in the same line, or even to extend it, the field lies very open. Greece may be said to be overrun as a field of archaeological discovery. If a statue shows its head in Athens, it is pounced upon and fought over by members of the French school, members of the German school, members of the Parnassus Society, and a crowd of miscellaneous aspirants. But Asia still remains, though it is impossible to say how long it may continue open. Cyprus, Æolis, Phrygia, all invite research, and would furnish remains of inestimable value. If the Dilettanti chose to be active, their command of funds would enable them to attain much on which younger and poorer societies, such as that lately founded for the "Promotion of Hellenic Studies," can only cast their eyes with longing.

LIEUTENANT BARNABAS.*

MR. BARRETT has, in the latter half of his third volume, gone a great way towards spoiling a really clever novel. There were certainly one or two considerable faults even in the earlier parts, but they were not by any means so great as to swamp its merits. If we had found it needful now and then to skip, yet on the whole we were interested and amused. Everything seemed to be in fair progress for a prosperous ending, when, on a sudden, the author chose to go on a new tack, and to desert the course over which he had hitherto carried us in an easy enough voyage. The harbour was almost in sight, the wind was blowing fair, nothing was needful but to let the ship sail quietly and steadily on, and in no long time master and passengers would have been landed in comfort and harmony. But "lo! a violent cross wind" came and blew us into far different regions. To drop our metaphor—as all wise people do when they have got all out of one that they can, and find themselves, moreover, in danger of getting entangled in it—we passed from a story that was cast in the old humorous type into one that was modelled after the latest school of sentiment and folly. The author apparently was struck with the thought that there is a fashion in writing as in everything else, and that, whatever liberties a man may allow himself for a time, he must in the end submit to the law as it is laid down in the circulating libraries. In the morning every one may wear

* *Lieutenant Barnabas*. A Novel. By Frank Barrett, Author of "Folly Morrison." 3 vols. London: Richard Bentley & Son. 1881.

as loose a coat as he pleases, in almost any colour, and of almost any cut; but when evening comes on, and the dinner hour is at hand, then we have all to conform to one and the same strict model. So, no doubt, it is with novels. Society will allow of a considerable freedom as the story opens, and even as it is carried on; but in the conclusion there must be no license, and silly sentiment in all its dullness must be allowed to assert its rights. The fair reader, as she closes the book and sends it back to Mudie, will not be defrauded of her sigh or her tear. The hero and heroine, of course, need not be killed, but may be happily married; but there must be at least one melancholy death, just before the wedding, to give a proper relish to the entertainment that the author provides. We are willing to hope that it was much against his will that Mr. Barrett yielded to the requirements of the age, and that in pleasing his readers he by no means pleased himself. He was, indeed, in a position of some perplexity. For, while his hero's half-brother was, in spite of one or two great failings, a virtuous man, his hero's half-brother's half-brother was a most gross and desperate villain. This ruffian would, by a novelist of the old school, have been swung off at Newgate or Tyburn without the slightest feeling of remorse, amid the hearty curses of the mob and to the great satisfaction of the reader. But such an ending would be too vulgar for our more delicate sentiments, and, moreover, it would have been, no doubt, very unpleasant, if not indeed very painful, for the virtuous half-brother. The difficulty is, therefore, got over in a most ingenious manner. The villain could not be allowed to live—that was clear enough—for he was bent on murdering the hero, and had twice already nearly carried out his purpose. His half-brother need not be allowed to live, for he was a good deal in the way, as he had been foolish enough to fall in love with the heroine, who was herself in love with his virtuous half-brother. Besides it would have been very painful for him, as we have said, to remain in a world out of which his wicked half-brother had been swung on a rope. His feelings and ours, too, are spared in the most ingenious manner. The disgust of a public execution and the disgrace of outliving a brother who had died on the scaffold are cleverly evaded by a murder and a suicide. The villain makes a third attempt to murder the hero. The virtuous half-brother, knowing that his half-brother by his mother's side was bent on killing his half-brother by his father's side, knowing moreover that the heroine was not for him, disguises himself in the hero's coat and hat, throws himself into the path of the villain, and gets at once shot by him through the heart. The villain, though he was not touched by the slightest tinge of remorse, happily draws his second pistol, and at once shoots himself through the head. The story, we feel, is brought to an impressive and yet cheerful end—for the villain had begun to bore us greatly—as we read that “he closed his eyes, and put the muzzle of his pistol slowly to his mouth; then with his thumb he pressed the trigger.” The rest is left to the reader's imagination, except in so far as he is assisted by four stars, which have the concluding line all to themselves. Whether they signify the scattering of the villain's brains, or the happy marriage of the surviving half-brother and the heroine after a decent period of mourning, we are at a loss to say.

The scene of the story is laid at the beginning of the century. We cannot allow that Mr. Barrett is very successful in bringing back the age of which he writes. In the year 1800 a gentleman was not likely to flatter his hostess by saying that “the King of France had no better cook than hers”; nor was she likely to mention “the prodigious fortune of the Marquis of Westminster.” The King of France and his cook were in that year things of the past; while the Marquess of Westminster belonged to the future. A gentleman living in Edmonton would not find his letters and the *Times* lying on his breakfast-table when he entered the room, unless, indeed, he breakfasted at an hour when most people were thinking of dining. The West-end road by which the highwayman goes by Hornsey Wood was not made till nearly thirty years after the date of the story. We feel confident that the word “financier” did not eighty years ago bear the meaning that Mr. Barrett gives it when he joins it with “banker.” Not even would a highwayman in that age have so grossly abused our language as to call a thing “reliable.” The hair of heroines, moreover, at that date was raven black. A case or two of auburn locks, perhaps, might be found in a rustic beauty, but “soft gold red hair” was not invented till nearly three-quarters of a century later, while aureoles were as unknown as even the Marquess of Westminster. The ladies do, to be sure, all drink dishes of tea and not cups, but one swallow does not make a summer. Nevertheless, though Mr. Barrett is not very happy in reproducing the age of which he writes, yet, till he comes to his fatal conclusion, the age in which he writes is successfully kept in the background. We feel sure that he has a far stronger taste for the great masters of humorous fiction who were once the glory of our country than for the feeble sentimentalists, with their ridiculous affectations, who are at present its disgrace. Had he carefully kept to the great writers, and never allowed his taste to be corrupted by the bad school of our days, we are confident that he could have produced a story of real power and merit. As it is, there are in *Lieutenant Barnabas* two or three characters which are drawn with great skill, and more than one scene of a humour which unfortunately is only too rare. The hero, Tom Talbot, and the heroine, who always passes by the name of Lady Betty, are both good in their way—so good, indeed, that, as we close the book, we seriously trust that the four stars, which we have already mentioned, signify their marriage, and not the villain's scattered

brains. The love scenes between them are very prettily managed, and the difficulties which the heroine has for nearly two volumes in convincing herself that she does really love her gallant admirer are described in a way which ought to have a particular charm for all young ladies. Then, too, the mysterious and most alarming disappearance of the hero for nearly the whole of the third volume, if not managed with any great art, ought to be delightfully exciting for all those who do not begin each story by at once turning to see how it ends. In the present case, however, the end, with its four stars, is not made so clear as to spoil the mystery even for the over-curious. The best characters by far are not the hero or the heroine, not even the half-brother who murders, or the half-brother who is murdered, but an old doctor named Blandly and one Toby Slink, a simple country lad, who is tricked by the highwayman into being his squire. Poor Toby begins before long to suspect his master's real trade, but he is so frightened by his threats that he is not unwilling to accept all his statements as gospel. He thus repeats to an Irish pedlar the story which his master had told him:

“Well, there's a rascal who owes him a lot of money, and—he's looking about for him, and—and—he don't seem to quite remember the looks of him, and—and—when he meets anyone all alone, he just looks in his pocket to see if the money belongs to him, and—and if he's in doubt he takes it.”

“I understand the nature of the master's misfortune exactly; and what might you do all the time?”

“Why I just stand ready to help master, if he needs be; for if we meet the right rascal after all, it's more an' likely he'll try to get away without paying.”

One of his reasons for running away from his home and his old master had been the unkindness of his sweetheart. He managed to steal back to her one evening and to renew his courting. The whole scene is very prettily and humorously told. He began by telling her that she was like the young woman in the printed ballad he had given her last Maidstone Fair, who had led her sweetheart to rob and murder his uncle all for love. “If one day,” he added, “I'm hanged at Tyburn, you'll read your own name in my dying speech and confession.” Mr. Barrett, by the way, is again out in his dates when he more than once makes Tyburn the place of execution in 1800. But to return to our lovers. “You are not a murderer, Toby, are you?” the girl answers. “No; but I won't answer for what may happen. I'm going the road to ruin fast. I don't go to bed at eight o'clock now. . . . Look at me! I'm not what I was—a simple, innocent countryman.” He then reproaches her with not having altered. “Have you lost a single pound since I have been away?” “I can't help it, Toby,” she replied. “I didn't eat anything for a whole day after you went away, but the next morning my appetite was too strong for me.” At last they are reconciled, and he makes her a present of some ornaments, but she wants to know how he had earned the money to buy them. “Give 'em me back, Jenny,” he said, “you shan't wear 'em, dear.” Before long he sends her a token which she need not be ashamed to wear, he says, for “it was bought with my own money honestly, mending the pigsty for Mrs. Smith, the sexton's wife, who is writing this letter for me now.”

In pleasant contrast with this simple countryman is the whimsical, but most tender-hearted, old doctor. So pleasant, indeed, is Dr. Blandly that we can only regret that he lived eighty years ago and died a bachelor. We should have liked to join him, or some chip of the old block, had there been one, in the fishing-parties to the Lea River, and in the snug little dinners, with the bottle of old Madeira, in the old country-house in Edmonton. We must leave our readers to make his acquaintance themselves, and we can assure them that, in the pleasure he will give them, they will be inclined to overlook the faults, grievous as they are, with which our author brings his story to so weak an ending. We must not, however, follow him in making our last words our worst, but must thank him for a tale which, looked at as a whole, is both amusing and original.

FARRAR'S MERCY AND JUDGMENT.*

IT is not very obvious at first sight why this book has been written. Dr. Farrar published three years ago, under the not very lucid title of *Eternal Hope*, five sermons preached at Westminster Abbey on the subject of future retribution, which were understood by most of his hearers as conveying a denial of the doctrine of eternal punishment, and would have been so understood probably by his readers, but for an explicit and apparently somewhat inconsistent disclaimer of “Universalism.” Dr. Pusey brought our last year “in reply” to this volume, which had attracted an attention due more to the author's position and rhetorical power and the place where the discourses were originally delivered than to its intrinsic weight, a thoughtful and learned work entitled *What is of Faith as to Everlasting Punishment?* And Dr. Farrar now informs us in his prefatory chapter—as he had already stated in letters to the *Guardian*—that while his present work “in form is a reply to Dr. Pusey, in reality my convictions are almost identical with his, except on minor points of history and criticism.” But if so, why publish it at all? The fact seems to be that Dr. Farrar, among whose many unquestionable gifts that

* *Mercy and Judgment. A Few Last Words on Christian Eschatology in reference to Dr. Pusey's "What is of Faith?"* By F. W. Farrar, D.D., F.R.S. Macmillan & Co. 1881.

of an accurate and philosophical mind can hardly be reckoned, and who has evidently taken up theological questions *pro re nata* rather than from any special sympathy or familiarity with that branch of study, does not very clearly appreciate either Dr. Pusey's point of view or his own. In spite of his reiterated and unquestionably sincere assertion that he is not a Universalist, he propounds views which to ordinary readers will appear scarcely distinguishable from Universalism. So far as we understand him—and his language gives one the impression of a writer who is swayed more by strong sentiment than definite conviction—he certainly regards Universalism as an open question, and this is a conclusion not identical with Dr. Pusey's, who regards it as a condemned heresy, but directly contrary to it, nor can the opposition be called "a purely verbal" one. We are not of course going to enter here on a discussion as to what is the truth on the solemn subjects in dispute between them, nor is there any occasion for doing so. The question of what is the "orthodox" doctrine, in the sense of the received belief of the Christian Church from the first, is a matter not of opinion but of fact, capable like other facts of critical investigation, and to this test both writers profess to be appealing. Dr. Farrar insists again and again that his "views are in the strictest accordance with all that is required by the Catholic Church," with the teaching of "her four great Councils and authentic creeds and formularies, of writers of all ages who have lived and died in full communion with the Catholic Church," with what has constantly "been taught by Christians within the pale of the Catholic Church." But the force of this appeal to Catholic tradition is seriously weakened by his elsewhere repudiating the notion of making "the truth of any doctrine depend on the decisions of Councils," or of there being any ground why "the ecclesiastics of the sixth century"—or, we presume, of any earlier one—could claim any clearer illumination than those of the nineteenth. Moreover, among "the views of those who have died in full communion with the Catholic Church" are cited the testimonies of Luther, Calvin, and a host of foreign Protestants and English Dissenters of various sects, who can only be included by a definition of "the Catholic Church" which would make it coextensive with the widest pale of nominal Christianity. And the test applied in this vague sense loses all distinctive value. Nor is this all. There is, as we have already intimated, no less vagueness in Dr. Farrar's treatment of the point to be proved than of the criterion to be applied. He begins by assuring us that he has never denied and does not now deny "the eternity of punishment," which it was the object of Dr. Pusey's book to vindicate. But he at once goes on to say that he "understands the word eternity in a sense far higher than can be degraded into the vulgar meaning of endlessness," the point at issue not being whether eternal has not "a higher meaning"—as every one admits it to have in reference to eternal life—but whether it does not in any case include the meaning of endless. When, again, Dr. Farrar says, "I have never even denied, and do not now deny, even the possible endlessness of punishment"—which, however, he calls elsewhere "an immense and startling dogma," not taught but contradicted by Scripture—the words we have italicized show that he is treating as a mere subordinate detail the main issue of the contention between himself and his opponents.

There is the same incoherence in his treatment of the question of Purgatory, which recurs again and again in the volume, and on which he professes to agree with Dr. Pusey, especially as to its involving "a future purification, instead of a state of probation, for those who have not utterly extinguished the grace of God in their hearts." Certainly we had imagined, like Dr. Pusey, that he very strongly insisted in *Eternal Hope*, and in his paper in the *Contemporary Review*, as does Dr. Plumptre, whom he quoted, on a fresh probation after death. He now tells us that "he had scarcely referred to the idea of probation at all, and certainly had laid no stress upon it." Yet so little does he seem even now to realize the radical difference between the notion of a purgatory for those who die imperfect—which has been very generally held in the Church, with many variations as to minor points of detail, and is strongly advocated by Dr. Pusey—and that of a second probation for all who have failed on earth—which is the very view rejected by Dr. Pusey and condemned in the case of Origen—that he habitually confuses or interchanges the two ideas in the course of his volume. In the very next page, *e.g.*, to that from which we have just quoted, he tells us that his views on the point are "substantially the same as those of Dr. Plumptre," though Dr. Plumptre himself is fully aware of the fundamental distinction referred to, for he published in the *Contemporary Review* a long correspondence between Cardinal Newman and himself about it. Elsewhere he speaks of "many a change in Hades before it is easy to distinguish between the best of the evil and the lowest of the good," which can only point, if the words have any meaning, to a second probation in Hades; and yet only two pages before he had again declared that Dr. Pusey's view of "some purification of imperfect souls in the world to come" conceded all he asked. We read, again, that St. Augustine's doctrine of "that terminable retribution, that purgatorial fire beyond the grave, was my main thought in *Eternal Hope*"; but St. Augustine, who was the first to put into definite shape the doctrine of Purgatory as afterwards maintained, condemned the teaching of Origen in the strongest terms. Yet Dr. Farrar speaks in the formal "Statement of his Eschatological Belief," at the end of the volume, of repentance being open to sinners "at least until the Great Judgment in the Intermediate State beyond the grave"; and says, still more explicitly, that "the great separation of souls into two classes will not take place until the final judgment." This is not Augustinian

but Origenist doctrine, and the two, we repeat, are fundamentally different, and involve totally diverse conceptions, ethical as well as dogmatic. We have dwelt thus fully on these contrarities because they not only illustrate the author's vagueness of treatment, to say the least, but illustrate it in connexion with what is an integral portion of the very subject in dispute. It would be equally easy to point out, were there room for doing so, how constantly what Dr. Pusey had shown, and he had himself admitted, to be mere "accretions" of the disputed doctrine, and no part of it, whether true or false, are here mixed up with it in inextricable confusion, as though "the doctrine of endless torment for the vast majority is material flames"—which Dr. Pusey does not defend any more than himself—was the real issue to be decided. While, again, he repudiates both Universalism and Annihilationism, many of the authorities he cites are avowed Universalists or Annihilationists.

Nothing can be further from our purpose than to insinuate any charge of disingenuousness against the author. That his want of precision is largely due to an intellectual habit of mind, better suited to hortatory eloquence than to theological discussion, is more than probable; partly the fault may arise from hasty composition, which will also help to account for the manifold detailed inaccuracies throughout the book. Thus, for instance, in three successive passages John Scotus Erigena is called "the greatest and acutest of all the Schoolmen," and is cited as a very high authority on doctrine. Now, in the first place, Scotus Erigena stands outside of Scholasticism properly so called, and he is so far from being a high doctrinal authority that he was not only notoriously heterodox, but has been very generally charged with pantheism, to the verge of which he approached on the most favourable estimate; even Neander, who defends him, admits that pantheism is the only logical result of his system. The quotation from Bishop Butler's *Analogy*, which is probably borrowed from Dr. Plumptre, and is twice repeated, about the advantageous tendency of virtue "to amend those who are capable of amendment" in the next world, by example or otherwise, is wholly irrelevant, for Butler was expressly speaking, as the context proves, of "other orders of creatures" distinct from man. Still stranger is the citation from Alban Butler's *Lives of the Saints* to prove that "the circumstance of a material fire" in hell is "a mere scholastic question." The statement may be correct enough, but the passage cited has nothing to do with it, for the very sentence before that quoted shows that the author was speaking, not of hell, but of purgatory. It is a still graver mistake, when reference is made to two passages in posthumous works of the late J. S. Mill, to show that in his opinion "every other objection to Christianity sinks into insignificance compared with" the doctrine of endless sufferings in hell. In both passages the whole stress is laid on the predestination of "the great majority of mankind" to these torments, two of the "accretions" which had been inculcated on the elder Mill by his Presbyterian instructors. With similar recklessness Dr. Farrar says, "Dr. Pusey and Mr. Oxenham seem to fancy that the opinion" that the majority will be lost "is in some way connected with Calvinism," and then goes on to insist that "it is centuries older than Calvinism." Of course it is; and neither of the writers mentioned had said anything else. Dr. Pusey merely observes that "it is further aggravated by engrafting into it the heresy of Calvin," and Mr. Oxenham that "it has been widely held, both among Catholics and Protestants, though, for reasons," which he proceeds to explain, "chiefly among the latter." These are but a few specimens, culled almost at random, of inaccurate use of authorities, nor would it be difficult to show, from the context or from collations of other kindred passages, that several of Dr. Farrar's patristic citations, borrowed probably at secondhand from Mr. Jukes's *Restitution* or some work of the kind, cannot possibly bear the sense here assigned to them. It is characteristic again of Dr. Farrar's method of argument that, while he dismisses any scriptural phrases found in Fathers or Schoolmen with the remark that "it is not proven" they meant any more than he supposes Scripture to mean, and are therefore "metaphorical" and "indisicative," yet when they interpret the language of Scripture by terms of their own, he equally dismisses their statements, as "unsanctioned by Scripture." In other words, if they adhere to the exact words of Scripture, their statements prove nothing; if they use terms of their own, they have no right to use them, and therefore prove too much. Thus again, when Justin Martyr uses an expression which, by divorcing it from the context, may be twisted into favouring Annihilationism, it is eagerly seized upon; but when he positively insists on future punishment being "endless" (*αἰδιος*), as contrasted with temporary punishment, Dr. Farrar "cannot see that he necessarily meant endless in all its strictness." With similar inconsistency Theodore of Mopsuestia and Diodorus of Tarsus, both of whom were condemned as heretics at the Fifth General Council, are counted "among the best and greatest and most authoritative of the Fathers" when they favour Universalism; but when Tertullian and Minucius Felix and the forgers of the Clementines speak strongly on the other side, we are at once reminded that the first "lapsed into heresy," while the two others "are both heretics and slanderers," and cannot therefore be allowed to have any authority at all. That is very like saying that a heretic with Universalist leanings is thereby purged of his heresy, whilst the faintest suspicion of an heretical taint suffices to put an advocate of the opposite doctrine out of court. Josephus, who asserts emphatically the Jewish belief in eternal punishment, is, with the same ingenious perversity, put aside as "an untrustworthy witness" because he is in the

habit of falsifying Jewish opinions, in order to please his Pagan masters, which only adds further weight to his testimony on a doctrine peculiarly distasteful to the Romans.

It is only fair to acknowledge that, in spite of the defects already noticed, the general tone of this book is more temperate and judicial than that of *Eternal Hope*, and that Dr. Pusey, as a rule, is treated with scrupulous courtesy. Still the author sometimes allows himself, especially towards the close of the volume, when his pen seems to run away with him, in some strange outbreaks of temper. Thus in one place a Scriptural argument, which divines from St. Augustine to Dr. Pusey have usually—and very reasonably—held to be a weighty one, is flung aside as “a stock sophism,” and “a plea ignobly selfish.” Another Scriptural interpretation is contemptuously dismissed with the remark that “the Bible does not lend itself quite so easily to the manipulations of the *odium theologicum*,” as though the *odium antitheologicum* was not in the present day at least equally common. A favourite argument of St. Augustine’s—questionable perhaps but very generally urged—“it is difficult to treat without scorn,” and he is himself “the great repository of arguments on this subject alike doctrinally, morally, and exegetically false.” Nor is Dr. Farrar much more tolerant of the supposed lapses of contemporary authors. One of those already named is charged with making “an assertion which can only be due to the blindest prejudice,” and “is at any rate most astonishingly false”; to us it appears a truism. The views of a second—one of the leading Nonconformist divines and preachers of the day, and a singularly temperate writer—are threatened with “the speedy extinction which awaits *wilful error*” (the italics are not ours), and here again the incriminated statement appears to us obviously correct. But we have no desire to dwell on blemishes of this kind, which the author himself will probably regret. Into the doctrinal merits of the controversy this is hardly the place to enter. But we must observe that, as regards the appeal both to Jewish and early Christian eschatological belief and the dispute about the case of Origen, which occupy a large portion of Dr. Farrar’s as of Dr. Pusey’s book, the latter writer appears to us to have, in spite of some incidental mistakes, very much the best of the argument. Nor is there anything in the three chapters devoted to Scriptural exegesis, which are perhaps the weakest in the volume, to shake the force of a remark of Dean Goulburn’s, in the preface to his recent volume of *Lectures on Everlasting Punishment*, “that the real objections to the doctrine lie deeper than any Scriptural texts, and that, were only Scripture itself in question, no doctrine but the old-fashioned orthodox one would have ever found acceptance.” It is difficult to resist the impression that Dr. Farrar has again and again, however unconsciously, read his own meaning into Scripture rather than found it there. That this is notably the case as regards his very perfunctory treatment of the critical word *aiōnos* might be inferred from the fact that so distinguished a Greek scholar as the late Rev. James Riddell of Balliol has shown, in a note extracted by Dr. Pusey, that even in classical authors “*aiōn* had very early the sense of unlimited duration, and further that, in proportion as, in the hands of philosophers, this conception was more and more consciously dwelt upon, *aiōn* had this sense more and more precisely fixed upon it.” His inadequate appreciation of the force and extent of the Scriptural argument is sufficiently evidenced by the author’s assertion that the texts urged in support of the received doctrine “are few in number,” and by his way of confining his argument to these few texts, ignoring many others, and also ignoring what has been urged on the other side from the cumulative force of Scripture teaching as a whole. He seems also to have very imperfectly apprehended the ethical bearing of the argument. Such considerations must not of course be pressed beyond their due limits, but still great weight must attach to such a judgment as that pronounced by the late Professor Mozley, who was one of the last men to be dominated by imagination or passion or prejudice or mere routine orthodoxy, and who was not at all unconscious of the difficulties of the subject. Yet he has left on record his deliberate conviction that “the release from the notion of eternal punishment would be felt by the great mass as a release from the sense of moral obligation, and relying on the certainty that all would be sure to be right at last, men would run the risk of intermediate punishment, whatever it might be, and plunge into self-indulgence without hesitation.” He adds still more strongly that “a general relaxation of moral ties, a proclamation of liberty and security, the audacity of sins which had before been abashed, carelessness where there had been hesitation, obstinacy where there had been faltering, and defiance where there had been fear, would show a world in which the sanctions of morality and religion had been loosened, and in which vice had lost a controlling power, and got rid of an antagonist and a memento.” Such considerations should, at least, have their weight with a writer whose real antipathy to the received doctrine is based far more on its alleged “danger,” as revolting and abhorrent to the moral sense, than on Scriptural or traditional difficulties, though he, of course, does his best to enlist the sanction of Scripture and Tradition on his side, and is fully persuaded of his success. Dr. Farrar is always a picturesque and interesting writer, and his manifest sincerity cannot fail to conciliate sympathy, but he appears to us to do himself least justice when he essays theological discussion, for which neither his antecedents nor intellectual bent give him any peculiar aptitude.

NOS AUTEURS DRAMATIQUES.

M. ZOLA has long been very ill satisfied with the present condition of French dramatic literature, and he has also for long been giving emphatic utterance to his dissatisfaction in the columns of the *Voltaire* and the *Bien Public* in the form of critical articles. If the amount of anger caused by criticism is any test of its value, M. Zola is entitled to be gratified by the testimony borne to his own; for, though we may hesitate about accepting his estimate of the effect he has produced, there can be no doubt that he has succeeded in making a great many gentlemen very angry. According to M. Zola himself, the main, if not the only, occupation of the literary world of Paris has for some time been the answering of these articles and the calumniating of their author. He has held the honourable, though painful, position of the prophet of *naturalisme*, rejected with violence by a vain people. The facts are probably somewhat short of this; but, none the less, many of his contemporaries have agreeably flattered his not inconsiderable sense of his own importance by showing themselves severely hurt by his strictures. The effect produced by his articles may be attributed to other causes than the force of his criticism. A writer who disposes of M. Victor Hugo by bawling at him “Bourgeois! bourgeois! bourgeois” may be trusted to cause a smart shock to most Frenchmen of delicate nerves, which will not be soothed by the condescending praise of other passages, or by such a summing up as this:—

La représentation de Notre Dame de Paris m’a, en somme, confirmé dans mon opinion que le théâtre de Bouchardy vaut le théâtre de Victor Hugo. Il n’y a qu’une différence de style. Quand le poète écrit lui-même Ruy Blas, il rime un chef-d’œuvre de poésie lyrique. Quand il laisse coudre de sa prose dans Notre Dame de Paris, il obtient un mélodrame des plus médiocres.

Loud critical pretensions on the part of a writer who classes together, for the purpose of judging a dramatist, an original play, and an adaptation to the stage by somebody else of one of the dramatist’s romances, must have been found, we can well believe, singularly irritating. Of the rest of M. Zola’s critiques of Victor Hugo—as we do not propose to refer to them again—we need only say that it includes a charge of literary dishonesty. How the writer deals with lesser men may be judged from his treatment of the acknowledged chief of French literature. He recognizes a certain merit in MM. de Goncourt, and even great merit in the fine naturalism of Erckmann-Chatrian’s copious eating and drinking which make the dramatic action of *L’Ami Fritz*; to M. Théodore de Banville he condescends as a very big dog might to a very small and amusing puppy; but, as a rule, his tone towards contemporary dramatists is accurately described in the following words from his own preface:—“Une légende veut que je me sois montré à leur égard d’une brutalité de sauvage, rongé de jalousie, sans la moindre idée critique qu’une envie basse de tout détruire.” What M. Zola’s motives may be we shall not presume to decide; and indeed we believe him sufficiently well satisfied with himself to deserve acquittal from the charge of jealousy; but how far he deserves the charge of underbred insolence in his tone towards his contemporaries our readers can judge from the following quotation, taken from the chapter devoted to M. Victorien Sardou:—

Il n’y a actuellement que deux situations possibles pour un auteur dramatique : tout sacrifier au succès, dégringoler jusqu’en bas la pente du médiocre et se consoler en ramassant des bravos et des pièces de cent sous ; ou bien vouloir tenter la littérature sur les planches, tâcher de mettre debout des personnages en chair et en os et risquer alors les plus abominables chutes qu’on puisse rêver. M. Sardou, par tempérament sans doute, a choisi le chemin bordé de fleurs. C’est tant pis pour lui. A mesure qu’il avance le public lui demande des farces plus grosses. “Allons, plus bas ! plus bas ! agenouille-toi davantage ! plus bas encore ! dans le ruisseau ! C’est notre bon plaisir ; nous aimons les gens que nous salissons.” Et il ne peut se relever dans l’orgueil de son génie libre et indompté, car c’est lui-même qui s’est mis à genoux le premier pour montrer ses plus jolis tours.

M. Zola is quite as merciless towards the critics. They are, he is never tired of saying, a race of imbecile persons oppressed by conventionality. They “pataugent” (our author is very much in love with the verb *patauger*) “là devant avec des cris de volailles effarouchées.” They would dearly like to say that Molière could not write a play and that Racine is dull, if they only dared. In their dealings with the modern stage their one object is to crush everything that has the slightest originality—an accusation which, he seems to think, has never been brought against critics before. The whole is seasoned with loud-mouthed expressions of contempt and personalities of the kind likely to commend themselves to a writer who believes that the workman of the outer boulevards challenging another to the fray is a “true hero of Homer.” This sudden intrusion of the *swate* into the rapier practice of French literary warfare must have been disconcerting, and sufficiently accounts for what success M. Zola has had in causing pain and annoyance.

We have dwelt at length on M. Zola’s tone towards his contemporaries, because we believe that his critical method owes all the originality it possesses to this “brutalité de sauvage.” Putting that aside, there is nothing in his book with which we are not already perfectly familiar. That the characters of a play had better be original, and must be true to their surroundings and consistent with themselves; that the plot should be coherent and the

climax produced by the most simple and natural means possible, are the truisms on which M. Zola clamorously insists, as if they had not been the commonplaces of criticism from the beginning of time. Their virtue is in the application. Now M. Zola's way of applying them is to make one or other the one thing necessary, according as he wishes to praise or blame. *Les maîtres* are lavishly praised, with the generosity it is so easy to show to men who are no longer rivals. The moderns are rebuked for not doing what it was right in the men of Lewis XIV.'s time to neglect. Blots which have been perfectly obvious to everybody are pointed out with a great parade of original acumen and a plentiful reasoning of terms of contempt. And withal M. Zola cuts the ground from beneath his feet by denying that there are any general laws governing dramatic literature. They vary completely, according to him, with every generation. It was a mistake to reprint these articles. Literary mud-throwing is an effective way of attracting notice, but it depends on its suddenness for most of its effect. In an isolated article a good loud personality covers many critical sins; but in a collection want of coherence in the ideas is apt to become painfully obvious. Of course, M. Zola, who, as we know, on his own authority, is a scientific writer, has judged his contemporaries "en homme de méthode," as we learn from the same competent witness. Only unfortunately, when we have come to the end of his survey, we find the method still to seek. He supplies us with a literary confession of faith which resolves itself into his favourite formula, that we must look at man as he is; but, when he himself sets to work to show how this is to be done in the theatre, this test of the truth of all literature seems to be very uncertain in its working. He finds the *Misanthropes* and *Les Horaces* very admirable in their analysis of character, and still more for their contempt of stage effect. The second half of his praise does not seem very consistent with his admiration of Molière's skill in constructing and developing a play. He makes no attempt to reconcile the first with his theory that *naturalisme*—the vulgar copying of life, and any sort of life—is the one end of literature. On the contrary, he fiercely defends Corneille against an imaginary critic for not making *Les Horaces* like any world except the poetic one of tragedy. To be sure, when M. Zola is not using the works of *les maîtres* as missile weapons against M. Sardou, his opinion undergoes a convenient change. He finds the characters of Shakespeare and of Victor Hugo, whom he apparently classes together as dramatists, not enough like life. He is arguing here, with exceptional courtesy, against M. Théodore de Banville in favour of his great principle, the necessity of scientific accuracy in the literary representation of the world. The utter want of any sign of this in their personages annoys him, and he is of opinion that they lose by it. Compare them—at least compare "les matamores d'Hugo" with "César Birotteau, ce gigantesque lutteur," and see how mean they look in comparison, says M. Zola. It is, of course, necessary to M. Zola's literary theories that Balzac should be accepted as having drawn life with a vulgar accuracy, and how enormous a supposition that is we need not say; but we might at least expect him to have some understanding of the characters of the writer whom he clamorously proclaims as his master. The epithet of gigantic as applied to poor César Birotteau, who mistook the wild dance of impracticable schemes in his brain for "la substantielle action du talent," may cause some doubt as to the value of M. Zola's praise, endless and noisy as it is, of *La Comédie humaine*. As we are on the subject of M. Zola's adoration of Balzac, we cannot avoid making the pedantic criticism that, however he may be inspired by the master's spirit, he does not appear to have much knowledge of the details of his work. Having occasion to rebuke M. Octave Feuillet for his certainly excessive fondness for introducing duels, he ventures the statement that there is but one in the masterpieces of Balzac. Of course M. Zola may have an esoteric interpretation of the word masterpiece; but it would certainly appear from this that he has never read either *Le Père Goriot*, *Un grand Homme de Province à Paris*, nor *La Peau de Chagrin*. Be it observed that M. Zola has already put Molière and Shakespeare side by side; and as he classes Victor Hugo with Shakespeare and Bouchard with M. Victor Hugo, we get, on the principle that things equal to the same thing are equal to one another, a very curious classification. Corneille, Molière, Shakespeare, Victor Hugo, and Bouchard, that is how M. Zola's critical faculty ranks the masters of dramatic literature.

What is the naturalism that M. Zola seeks and does not find on the theatre? His pompous phrases about scientific accuracy and "le document humain" throw no light on the question, being, like the schemes of César Birotteau, a mere movement *in vacuo*. The nearest approach to a clear definition is, we believe, to be found in his criticism of M. Emile Augier. He gives a qualified admiration to *Les Lionnes pauvres*, but reproaches the author for his want of courage in not pushing it to the extreme development of which it was capable. Why mask the figure of Séraphine behind Térèse? Why, having had the opportunity to be so utterly foul, keep within even wide bounds of decency? Our stage, says M. Zola, *meurt d'honnêteté*, is dying of mere decency. We will not give human beastliness its fair share—that is, much the larger part—of our literature. This criticism, repeated on many other pieces, contains the real creed of the naturalist school. Life for them means the diseases and the corruptions by which life is ultimately destroyed.

CANONICITY.*

IT would be interesting to learn what reasons moved Dr. Charteris to select the word "Canonicity" as the title for an expanded and amended edition of Kirchhofer's *Quellensammlung*. The word is scarcely Protestant, it is certainly not Presbyterian. All orthodox Presbyterians, Independents, Baptists, Wesleyans, and Plymouth Brethren agree in their uninquiring adoption of the traditional and ecclesiastical "canon" of Holy Scriptures as final and authoritative; but we cannot help thinking that the words "canon," "canonicity," and "canonical" must grate upon their ears and come hesitatingly from their pens. The Swiss Professor, to whom Dr. Charteris and many others are so largely indebted, simply called his book "A Collection of Sources for the History of the Canon." He was too exact a thinker not to perceive that a *Canon*, in its historical meaning, and a *Sammlung*, as he employed that word, are in no sense equivalent expressions. The founders and early legislators of Presbyterianism carefully abstained from taking upon themselves the dangerous responsibility of using the phrase "canonical" in their dogmatic definitions concerning the authority of Holy Scripture. Dr. Charteris has included amongst his other additions to Kirchhofer a collection of extracts from authoritative documents of the last three centuries—Orthodox Eastern, Tridentine, Old Catholic, Lutheran, and Reformed. He locates the Church of England—after the absurd fashion universally current amongst German theologians until recent years—amongst the subdivisions of an ecclesiastical solidarity called "the Reformed Church." Such an ecclesiastical solidarity never existed outside the brains of Presbyterian theorists, though the Scottish and English Presbyterians, during the session of the Westminster Assembly, strove hard to compel the English Parliament to make this theory the basis of its ecclesiastical legislation. The non-Roman part of Western Christendom, according to this theory, is divided into two Churches—the Lutheran and the Reformed or Calvinistic; and the ancient national Church of England is nothing more than one of the subdivisions of the *Reformirte Kirche*. The theory is always confirmed and illustrated in German text-books by a comparative presentation of the *Confessio Helvetica I.* and *II.*, *Confessio Gallicana* (Huguenot), *Confessio Bohemica*, the Scottish Confessions of Knox and of the Westminster Divines, and many others, with the *Confessio Anglicana*, meaning by the latter the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion. It is evident from Pardon's collections (Book I. Tit. xviii.) that the Scottish Presbyterians, both in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, had an ambitious dream of Scotticizing the whole of Western Christendom, or at least of non-Roman Christendom, by persuading "the Protestant Princes and Commonwealths" to convoke "an Universal Assembly of the Church of Christ in the world, which was commonly called an Ecumenic Council." All "National and General Assemblies and Convocations" were to be represented at it. Every independent sovereignty in Europe, though it included less than fifty parishes, was to send "at least a representative of the Church therein by one pastor and ruling elder." It was assumed that the Presbyterianism of Scotland was the *jure divino* ideal toward which all other Reformed Churches were feeling their way, and "there being an universal harmony in all the Confessions of the Reformed Churches, the work of a General Council as to matters of faith would in all probability be sweet and easy." It was probably intended that when Pan-Presbyterianism of the Scottish type had spoken once and for all ecumenically, "the magistracy" should be urged to place its sword at the service of "the ministry." The Scottish Presbyterians, as Robert Baillie's letters show, put great faith in the sword. They relied on the Princes and Commonwealths to make short work with Papists, Lutherans, Anglicans, Independents, Anabaptists, Quakers, and all other gainsayers contrary to "the best Reformed Churches." The word "canonical" was used by the Swiss (of semi-Lutheran Basel) in 1537, by the Scots in 1560, by the Swiss (of Zwinglian Zürich) in 1566, and by the French (at La Rochelle) in 1571. We read in "Reformed" formularies of "Scriptura canonica," of "ces livres canoniques," and of "those bulks quibill of the ancient have been reputed canonical." But when we turn from these "Reformed" confessions to the Thirty-nine Articles, we find a most notable difference of language. The Anglican Article VI. grounds the acknowledgment of the "canonicity" of the books named in it upon the tradition, the consciousness, and the living witness of the historical Catholic Church. "In the name of the Holy Scripture we do understand those Canonical Books of the Old and New Testament of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church." It is worthy of observation that the careful and systematic Winer, in his *Comparative Darstellung*, though he cites portions of Articles VI., XIX., and XXI. in order to prove his foregone conclusion that the Anglican branch of the *Reformirte Kirche* agrees in its doctrine on Holy Scripture with all the other branches of that imaginary entity, actually omits these important words. The citation would have spoilt his theory. The sentence in the Latin—"eos canonicos libros V. et N. Testamenti, de quorum autoritate in Ecclesia nunquam dubitatum est"—occurs word for word in the *Confessio Württembergica*; and it happens that this confession was drawn up by the Lutheran

* *Canonicity: a Collection of early Testimonies to the Canonical Books of the New Testament, based on Kirchhofer's "Quellensammlung."* By A. H. Charteris, D.D., Professor of Biblical Criticism in the University of Edinburgh, and one of Her Majesty's Chaplains. Edinburgh: Blackwood & Sons. 1880.

Brenz and the Swabian theologians, and received the specific approbation of the Lutheran theologians in Saxony, including Melancthon. This fact smashes to pieces the hypothesis that the Thirty-nine Articles and the Westminster Confession may be bracketed together as documents of an imaginary universal Calvinistic "Reformed," or anti-Lutheran, Church. The old Scottish "Confession of our Faith, ratified and approved by the Estates in this present Parliament" (1560), uses a very different language. In that document "the inhabitants of the Realm of Scotland, professors of Christ Jesus," after declaring the authority of the Scriptures "to be of God, and nether to depend on men nor angels," go on to say, "We affirme, therefore, that sike as alleage the Scripture to have na other authoritie but that quhilk it hes received from the Kirk to be blasphemous against God, and injurious to the trow Kirk." We need scarcely say that neither Papists, Lutherans, nor Anglicans in any formulary have made any such allegation as the "trow Kirk" inferentially charges upon them. The later "Pan-Presbyterian" document, the Scottish-English Confession of the Westminster Assembly of Divines—composed when Puritanism, by the power of the sword and secular law, seemed about to realize a part of its ambitious dreams—begs the question of canonicity, while it scrupulously avoids the use of any such uncanny word. The Westminster Confession had in England a secular side. It was professedly a revision of the English Thirty-nine Articles, which the Parliament had handed over to "the divines" for correction and improvement. "The authority of Holy Scripture," said these authentic fathers and doctors of the Presbyterian Churches, "for which it ought to be believed and obeyed, dependeth not upon the testimony of any man or Church, but wholly upon God (Who is truth itself), the author thereof; and therefore it is to be received, because it is the Word of God. We may be moved and induced by the testimony of the Church to an high and reverend esteem of the Holy Scripture." We can imagine Selden or Lightfoot, or some other of the few critics and scholars in that solemn assembly, quietly observing, *sotto voce*, "So we are to believe that it is the Word of God because the Scottish Commissioners tell us that it is; for the Ecclesia of the Anglican Article VI. we are to substitute Knox, Baillie, Calamy, Nye, Marshall, and our contemporary Scottish and English Presbyterians." Of its authority "there was never any doubt in the (Presbyterian) Church," and the ground of their freedom from doubt—their "Canon," in fact—is stated in the words, "It doth abundantly evidence itself to be the Word of God."

How did these particular books, excluding others in some points similar to them, and sometimes treated as parts of the same whole, first acquire the title and the quality of "canonical"? What is meant by the "Canon," as applied to the recognized books of the Old and New Testaments? What authority presided, what principle of selection guided, during the building up of the Bible as we now have it, and as the Presbyterians accept it? Why were these particular books accepted, and why were other books rejected, in the process of constructing that whole which Dr. Charteris names "Canonicity"? These questions have been answered by Credner, Bleek, Oehler, Woldemar, Schmidt, Schenkel, Dr. Westcott, and many others in widely varying ways. But Dr. Charteris has not attempted any answer whatever; though, after the completion of his work, he seems to have been struck by the oddity that he should have compiled a book of 500 pages and called it *Canonicity*, without anywhere telling us what "canonicity" means. We presume that a remark in his preface is due to his late perception of this extraordinary omission. "It was originally intended," he says, "to have a chapter on the avowed grounds of the reception of the Canon in Christendom, especially since the Reformation." The authenticity of Scripture must be determined either by an objective or a subjective standard, or canon. A man may believe the Epistle to the Romans, or any other book of Holy Scripture, to be a part of the authentic Word of God, because the Church, or the entire Christian society, has always and everywhere believed it to be so, which is the "canon" implied in the Sixth Article. Or a man may believe a book to be part of God's Word because it evidences itself as such to him—because, as Coleridge puts it, it has a power of "finding us," or, as Luther put it at various times, because it "preaches Christ," or is "worthy of apostolical dignity." The testimony of the Church and the testimony of individual consciousness may of course concur; but it is impossible to derive any fixed and universal conception of canonicity from the latter alone. The "canon" for all Christendom cannot be set up by any one individual Christian. Dr. Charteris, however, is singularly loose in his employment of the phrase. He uses it when "authenticity," or "divine inspiration," or some other term, would be far more descriptive of his meaning. Thus, speaking of the Epistle to the Hebrews (p. 272), he observes, "The chief interest in this epistle attaches to the history of opinions on its canonicity." He here uses the word "canonicity" as a mere synonym for authorship or for apostolicity, or for authority on a level with that of the Epistle to the Romans. He fails to see that there can never again be any doubt as to the "canonicity" of this Epistle. It was at one time canonical in some churches while not yet canonical in others; but now every Church in Christendom has long accepted it as "canonical." It has been put into the "canon," and there it stands, and, as we suppose, ever will stand. No question, therefore, can be raised as to its "canonicity"; all that can now be asked is whether it obtained that canonicity on sufficient or (as Professor Overbeck of Basel has just asserted) on insufficient grounds. A modern Presbyterian would do wisely

to follow the prudent example of John Knox and the divines of the Westminster Assembly by not committing himself to the use of these dangerous words, unless he can show that "canon" means nothing more than a catalogue of selected books. But even this conclusion would have appalled Knox and the Presbyterian reformers, who, as Professor Given of Magee College tells us in his new book on the Canon, "set Canonical Scripture above the Church." Another eminent Presbyterian, Dr. Cunningham, determined that "canonicity" means "apostolic authorship." Dr. Given, perceiving that this theory does not "meet all the requirements of the (Presbyterian) case," substitutes for it "inspired authorship," and declares this to be "the main constituent in canonicity." Thus they go round and round in a ceaseless circle. For who decided which authors were and were not inspired? Who settled what books should be included in the select catalogue?

The materials which Dr. Charteris has brought together make up a very useful and much wanted work. Kirchhofer's book, published nearly forty years ago, is now very scarce. On comparing the two works together, we find that Dr. Charteris has omitted the parallel columns of Latin translation which Kirchhofer so diligently placed side by side with his Greek excerpts. Kirchhofer's quotations have been most carefully verified and corrected by the use of later and better texts. But, after conceding to the reviser all that is due to him—and much is due—we cannot regard Dr. Charteris as a substitute for Kirchhofer. The Scotchman has omitted much that is valuable in the Switzer's work. Dr. Charteris tells us in his preface that Kirchhofer was greatly indebted to Lardner; but he omits to tell us (what Kirchhofer relates in his own modest "Vorwort"), with what diligent labour the Swiss Professor verified every sentence which he quoted. Whenever he cited a passage from any Father, he read through the whole treatise or writing in which it occurred, and he made a point of writing out the excerpts from the original, even when he found them in Lardner or Orelli. In many cases we find that the notes of Dr. Charteris are mere translations, abbreviations, or paraphrases of Kirchhofer's notes. A reader who has not the German book at hand may easily attribute to Dr. Charteris a great deal which is not properly his own. This assertion may readily be proved by a comparison of Charteris and Kirchhofer on some particular section. Thus, in the section on the Epistle to the Hebrews, Tertullian and Caius are cited, and each citation is followed by a critical remark, which the reader will naturally attribute to Dr. Charteris, although it is freely borrowed from Kirchhofer, while no other reparation is made to him beyond the faint confession in the title-page and the preface. In the citation of Hippolytus, in the same section, Dr. Charteris was of course able to avail himself of help which was not open to Kirchhofer. In the citation of Dionysius of Alexandria, Dr. Charteris is very thin and generalizing, while Kirchhofer is full and elucidatory. Sometimes Dr. Charteris has curiously failed to avail himself of the good matter with which Kirchhofer has provided him. Thus, in the section on the Catholic Epistles, the author of *Canonicity* makes the jejune remark that "the origin and meaning of the term *Catholic* are obscure," although he had Kirchhofer's clear elucidation before his eyes. He must have seen it, for in the remainder of the same note he adopts Kirchhofer's citation of Clement of Rome and of Photius on Clement of Alexandria. The contrast betwixt the two is perhaps nowhere more striking, to the advantage of the Switzer, than in the poor notes of Dr. Charteris and the full, pithy, and suggestive notes of Kirchhofer upon the Shepherd of Hermas, in the section upon the Apocalypse, and in their notes upon the citations from Irenæus in the same section.

COLONEL PLAYFAIR'S MEDITERRANEAN.

THERE is something very pleasant during the inclemencies of an English summer in reading of the sunny regions which surround the great inland sea. Colonel Playfair's *Handbook* comes to us like the "beaker full of the warm South" for which poor perishing Keats longed. Just as the poverty-stricken bibliomaniac delights to read the catalogues of sales he cannot afford to attend, so when east winds blow and the showers fall, and the August fire blazes on the hearth, there is a sad sort of comfort in calculating the expenses of "a 150-ton schooner yacht," learning that it is well and sufficiently manned with a captain, mate, six seamen, cook, and cook-boy, and that a cruise of eight months may be managed for some 1,600*l.*; or of going through the list of the isles of Greece, and joining an imaginary shooting party on the Albanian hills; or of laying out seven days' excursions in the bay of Naples. The fascinations of a guide-book to stay-at-home travellers are, of course, all the greater when the book relates to out-of-the-way places, and when the information is pleasantly conveyed. Colonel Playfair seems equally at home in Constantinople and Tunis, in Ephesus and Crete, in Jaffa and Dalmatia. He tells us impartially about the great places and the small ones; about those engaging little islands which surround Elba; about the interior of Cyprus, about Oran and Scio. That one man should in the compass of an ordinary lifetime have visited all the places described seems impossible; but if Colonel Playfair writes in part from hearsay, it does not in the least diminish the value of his work. The north coast of Africa is of course most familiar to a consul at Algiers; but the account of it is not disproportionately

* *Handbook to the Mediterranean.* By Lieutenant-Colonel R. L. Playfair. London: John Murray. 1881.

long. The chapter on Malta is the first satisfactory description of that most interesting island which we have met with in any guide-book. The Suez Canal is not in the Mediterranean, but the history of the undertaking is not out of place *à propos* to Port Said. Grenada is now so easily visited from Malaga that the book would have been incomplete without some notice of it, though it lies a long way from the coast. The guide, in short, is chiefly intended for people who go down to the sea in yachts, and so far as can be seen without actual yachting experience of it, is admirably adapted to fulfil its purpose. It is fully furnished with maps and plans, and has charts of ports showing the depth of water, as well as a chapter devoted to an account of the safe anchorages in the Mediterranean.

The reader naturally turns at the present conjuncture to the account of Tunis. In it we do not find any mention of the redoubtable Kroumirs; but there is a paragraph relating to the Khomair tribe, "the most warlike and the most inimical to strangers of any on the N. coast of Africa." Colonel Playfair is much less likely to make a mistake as to an Arabic name than are the French authorities, and no reasonable man can doubt the existence of the Khomairs, though few reasonable men believe in the existence of the Kroumirs. Of Biserta and its famous harbour we have a full account. It is situated only thirty-six miles from Tunis by land. The name seems to be a corruption of Hippo Zarytus, or Hippo Diarrhytus. It is not to be confounded with the other city of the same name, Hippo the Royal, now generally remembered as the bishopric of St. Augustine. The situation of the town is very picturesque, as it is built on each side of a canal which leads from the lake to the sea, with a European quarter adjoining on an island. The harbour or lake now called Tinja, formerly Hipponitus Sinus—Colonel Playfair says "Hipponitus Pallus" (*sic*)—might, in the hands of a European Power, "become one of the finest harbours and one of the most important strategic positions in the Mediterranean." The French are about to prove the truth of this opinion. The pursuit of an ardent "love of glory," so they have lately assured the world, has led them, of course without any of those vulgar commercial objects which England pursues, to annex this "finest harbour in the Mediterranean." Its length from east to west is about eight miles. Its breadth is about five. A small portion of the strait or canal which connects it with the sea is shallow; but a few days' labour only will be required to deepen it, and the greater part of the passage is as deep as the lake within—namely, from thirty to forty feet. "A comparatively small expenditure would be required to convert the lake into a perfectly land-locked harbour, containing fifty square miles of anchorage for the largest vessels afloat." It will be strange, indeed, if the "love of glory" does not induce the French to incur this expenditure, and thus, so to speak, mask Gibraltar, Ceuta, and Malta. Colonel Playfair hardly does justice to the beautiful scenery of this coast, as viewed from the sea. Travellers proceeding to the East by any of the ordinary routes enjoy the exquisite colouring of the mountains and headlands when the vessel passes near the shore more than any other part of the voyage up the Mediterranean. The numberless little islands, long forgotten, which dot the deep blue sea, all of which have their English nautical names, their modern Arabic names, and their ancient names, are situated in such deep water and among such favourable currents that some navigators prefer even to run a little out of the course in order to pass among them. Colonel Playfair hardly mentions the romantic island of Galita, now uninhabited, and omits Galitona altogether. He names the Fratelli, the "Dog Rocks" of the English sailor, and says that one of them exactly resembles a high-backed chair; but he might have noticed the interesting, if comparatively trivial, point that the other has a hole completely through it. Then there are Zembra and Zembretta, and Kameta, pierced with a natural arched canal, and a round dozen more, some of which are crowned with pirates' castles on lofty cliffs, and others are low and green, covered with soft grass, on which for centuries, perhaps, no civilized foot has trod. They are now, perhaps, to be trodden by the civilized foot of the French Zouave. More charming headquarters for a yachtsman it is impossible to conceive than might be made of, say, Galita. A hut to contain stores, and occasionally to afford shelter in bad weather, would enable an adventurous sailor to make a series of delightful excursions among the other islands and on the mainland. The ancient remains all along the coast and on along the coast of Tripoli are of surpassing interest to the historian and antiquary, and are, moreover, as picturesque as any an artist can find in the whole Mediterranean. Perhaps the French may be able to make Tunis as comfortable for English winter visitants as they have made Algiers, but we must hope they will be able to do it without imitating the Turks in their oppression of the natives. Full particulars of the excursions to be made in the country round Tunis are to be found in the Handbook.

A considerable part of Colonel Playfair's first division relates to the Greek islands. It is curious to compare his notes on the state of the people and their surroundings with those of older writers. Thus Tournefort, who went through almost all the Archipelago, describes the Turks and their Government much as Colonel Playfair does, though there is an interval of one hundred and eighty years between the two travellers. There is the same speculation, the same dishonesty, the same carelessness of the future. In M. Tournefort's day there was more cruelty. Impalements and the "gauche" are not commonly used now, except in places remote from Western influences. But the massacre of Scio took place not so very long ago; and the miserable state of Crete is at the

present day as nearly as possible what it was at the beginning of the last century. But the Greek islands seem little superior to the Turkish, except in a certain possibility of improvement, a promise unfulfilled, which is absent from everything Turkish. M. Tournefort says of Argentiére, or Kimolos, that "the women have no other employment but making love and cotton stockings." Colonel Playfair says of the neighbouring island of Thera, or Santorin, that "knitting stockings is one of the principal industries of the island." No doubt love-making flourishes there as well, though the modern author discreetly mentions the stockings only. Another quaint passage in Tournefort relates to the volcanic rise of new islands, and this Santorin is still, as it was in his day, particularly celebrated for its "ups and downs" in the world. "What a fearful sight," he exclaims, "to see the teeming earth bring forth such unwieldy burdens! What a prodigious force must there needs be to move 'em, displace 'em, and lift 'em above the water." Of the port he says it is no wonder that it has no bottom, and adds, "I can't imagine whence it got the seeds of plants it was adorned with." Colonel Playfair's account is not so lively, but as a matter of fact it is curious to find him confirming Tournefort's assertion that the harbour has no bottom. "The half-moon harbour . . . is the crater of an extinct volcano, and is in parts unfathomable." Shortly after Tournefort's visit, namely, in 1707, a new island, Kaumene, rose to the surface; and from 1866 to 1870 a similar power was at work, adding to and altering the shape of the various islands and rocks which surround the harbour. The islanders must carry on their double occupation under difficulties. Even love-making can hardly thrive where "water and firewood are very scarce"; the unfortunate inhabitants, whom Colonel Playfair describes as an honest and industrious community, are obliged to obtain these commodities from Ios or Amorgos, yet they are passionately attached to their "lone volcanic isle." The neighbouring island of Naxos has an interest to the historian altogether apart from its connexion with the desertion of Ariadne—whom, by the way, Colonel Playfair never names—in the strange mediæval story of the Dukes of Naxos. "About 1204 it and several of the adjacent islands were seized by a Venetian adventurer named Marco Sanudo, who founded a powerful State under the title of the Duchy of Naxos. Favoured by Venice, his dynasty ruled over the greater part of the Cyclades for three hundred and sixty years, and finally succumbed to the Turks in 1566." Tournefort tells us a little more than this. Marco Sanudo was a noble Venetian, and obtained his title of duke from the Emperor at Constantinople. The islands of the Duchy were partly dismembered among his posterity, Paros going to another family, who retained it till the Turkish invasion. But Naxos had twenty-one dukes before Crispo. Solim II. turned him out, when, as Tournefort tells us, "he died of grief at Venice." When the Lusignans reigned in Cyprus, and the Veniers in Paros, and the Sanudos in Naxos, there must have been in the mere daily life of the islands materials for romances such as would furnish the world with a new Boccaccio or a new Chaucer. Some of these things are still on record for those who know where to look. Tournefort says of Naxos and its dukes that "F. Sanger, a Jesuit missionary very much esteem'd in the Levant by the name of F. Robert, has happily clear'd up the succession." Yachting under Colonel Playfair's guidance, pleasant as it will be, would have a large addition to its enjoyments if the romance of every islet were thoroughly set forth. But to have packed so much into so small a space, and to have made so few slips worse than a misprint in five hundred pages, chiefly consisting of names, dates, geographical and topographical figures, is enough to reflect credit on any author.

FOLK-LORE OF SCOTLAND.*

THIS, the last contribution to the publications of the Folk-Lore Society, is a collection of all the popular superstitions, many of which are still current among the people of the north-east of Scotland. Mr. Gregor has obtained his knowledge of their "lore" by mixing with the "folk" himself, so that all that he has written down concerning them has been gathered either from his own experience or noted down from the lips of old people who could tell him of such customs of their youth as had been discarded by a younger generation. Fishermen and sailors, warlocks and witches, and all such animated depositories of legendary lore, have been his everyday acquaintances, until, as he himself says:—

The North, with its hills, and vales, and woods, and rocks, and streams, and lochs, and sea—with its fairies, and waterkelpies, and ghosts, and superstitions—with its dialect, and customs, and manners, has become part of myself. Everything is changing, and changing faster than ever. The scream of the railway whistle is scaring away the witch, and the fairy, and the waterkelpie, and the ghost. To give an account of the olden time in the North, as seen by myself and as related to me by the aged, is the task I have set before me.

Life in this same olden time must have been even more burdensome than we find it in these days of ours. Endless were the ceremonies that had to be gone through to ward off ill luck and to propitiate the unseen powers to send good luck to every undertaking that a human being could propose to himself from his cradle to his grave. We do not on examination find among these superstitious beliefs much that is peculiarly distinctive of the

* Notes on the Folk-Lore of the North-East of Scotland. By the Rev. Walter Gregor, M.A. London: Folk-Lore Society. 1881.

district in which Mr. Gregor has collected them. They seem to be most, if not all, of them common to the whole of Scotland, while the dread of supernatural beings and belief in the powers of magic may be found in the tales of all nations. It seems strange that a people so practical as the Scotch should be so pre-eminently superstitious. But certain it is that many customs supposed to bring luck still linger among them, and their efficacy is largely believed in by the common people, although of course the strange rites and ceremonies of Halloween and Hogmanay night, as the last night of the year was called, have now degenerated into mere excuses for jollification, and are observed more in a spirit of sport than with any earnestness of intention. Yet the time is not long past when the powers of darkness were acknowledged as having more power on these two nights of the year than on any other, and were sought out and consulted in a spirit of awe and trembling that bore witness to the reality of the belief in their existence, and in their power to forecast the future fate of those who sought after them. In most cases these incantations were gone through with the object of finding out the future partner for life. And no doubt they frequently brought about their own fulfilment. For in a country neighbourhood where all the lads and lasses were known to each other, it would doubtless be very soon known to both the parties interested that fate had thus linked them together. Most of the rites peculiar to Halloween noted in Mr. Gregor's book are immortalized in Burns's poems. The credulity of those who practised them, with the deceptions to which they fell victims, give a fine subject for the poet's satire.

The chapter on Leechcraft contains some very astounding prescriptions. That they actually and frequently wrought cures affords additional testimony to the great effect that the mind has in healing actual bodily disease, if only the patient have full faith in the entire efficacy of the remedy. This healing power of faith, which doctors are day by day admitting more as a reality, throws light on the popularity of the miracle wells and healing shrines on the Continent, and forbids us to condemn as mere random lying the tales that are told of the astonishing cures effected by them. There are many such pilgrimage wells in Scotland cited by Mr. Gregor, although their healing efficacy was supposed to be an inherent virtue in the water, and not dependent on the favour of a saint. Some of these wells were surrounded by stones shaped like the several parts of the human body, called the "eye-stone," the "head-stone," and so on; and it was a necessary part of the treatment, after washing with water, to rub the part affected against the stone that bore the same form. This is the superstition of the Vui stone in the New Hebrides. Some offering was always left behind by those who tried the curing powers of the waters, even if it were only a rag from the patient's clothes. These tributes were hung up near the well, and every one abstained from disturbing them, as it was believed that whoever did so would get the disease that had been cured in the former patient. Just the same sort of thing was done as early as the time of the Romans. Votive offerings of hands, feet, almost every part of the body, have been excavated in the island sacred to Esculapius in the Tiber. The mode of cure in vogue then, however, was for the patient to go to sleep on the sacred spot, when it was revealed to him in a vision what he must do to ensure recovery. Among the cures for the whooping-cough, which are very numerous and improbable, we do not observe one which was in favour in some parts of Scotland. This was to sew a living caterpillar between two pieces of flannel, and wrap it round the patient's throat, leaving room for the animal to crawl round. By the time the grub died the whooping-cough was cured. Three roasted mice were an infallible cure for the whooping-cough. The same remedy is still much esteemed in Norfolk. There, however, swallowing one mouse is considered enough. The charming of warts is one of those perfectly unreasonable modes of cure that often prove efficacious when medical treatment fails. Dr. Carpenter cites as an instance of this strange truth the case of a girl who was cured of twelve warts by a friend who merely counted them, and then with an air of importance wrote the number down on a paper, assuring her that by Sunday they would all have disappeared. And so it proved. By the day named they were all gone, though the girl's father, himself a surgeon, had before tried to remove them with caustic and other applications in vain. If so very simple a prescription was enough to charm away a dozen of these unpleasant excrescences, we cannot wonder that the more elaborate forms of exorcism here enumerated should prove equally efficacious. In Switzerland the approved mode of charming a wart is to rub it with a snail and then put the snail on a thorn bush. Indeed, charm cures for other diseases are not by any means obsolete. In Yorkshire it is still believed that a set of mole's feet tied in a bag and worn round the neck keeps away cramp. And it is quite accepted as a fact by some persons that to carry a potato in the pocket secures immunity from rheumatism. These cures, like the miracle wells, prove the power that the will, if concentrated in sufficient force, has to cure any local affection of the body. The most remarkable case of this on record is the way in which the Prince of Orange cured the garrison of Breda of the surry by sending them a small phial of a decoction of camomile, wormwood, and camphor. It was diluted with a gallon of water to every three drops of the tincture, and served out as medicine to the sufferers, who from that day began to recover. Unfortunately the mind has even more power in inducing disease than in curing it. Hence the belief in witches' power of working ill, which disgraced the world so long, and in which Scotland had a melancholy pre-eminence. There, till quite

recently, every village had at least one old woman who was not "canny," whom it was well to keep on good terms with in case she should wish you some bodily ill. Mr. Gregor cites the case of a manse into which a tombstone had been built by the masons in revenge for the omission of the "fooin pint" at the laying of the foundation. This, it was believed, would make the house unhealthy, and the sad effect really followed. The ministers who lived there were very short-lived.

But, besides those superstitions common to all Scotland, there is one part of the book which can lay claim to a more special interest, as it refers to the beliefs current among the fisher part of the population, which seem to be peculiar to themselves. Fishermen and sailors are proverbially superstitious, and those of the east of Scotland are no exception to this general rule. Great ceremonies were observed at the launching of a new boat, and the greatest care had to be taken to avoid doing anything that might bring ill luck to the boat or the fishing. The boats were liable to be affected by an evil eye or an ill foot, like any land undertaking, but there were evil influences to be dreaded that were local in their application. For instance, it was believed to be unlucky to have a white stone among the ballast, but this was only in some villages. Great care had to be taken to avoid any one who was believed to have an "ill foot," and, if any one got this reputation, he was dreaded and shunned by all his neighbours. There is an amusing story told of two men in one village who both had the unenviable distinction of having an ill foot without being themselves conscious of it. They both set out one morning early to rouse the village for the fishing, and each meeting the other and knowing his ill repute, they both turned back, so that a fine morning's fishing was lost to the village. Indeed, there were so many untoward circumstances that might prevent the success of the fishing that it is quite a marvel how they ever contrived to catch any fish at all. When we read that a fisherman would have returned, under fear of being drowned, if any one asked him where he was going as he went down to his boat, one cannot but wonder how he ever contrived to elude that very natural inquiry. Odder still was the ban put on certain words, as will be seen from the following extracts:—

When at sea the words, "minister," "kirk," "swine," "salmon," "trout," "dog," and certain family names, were never pronounced by the inhabitants of some of the villages, each village having an aversion to one or more of the words. When the word "kirk" had to be used, and there was often occasion to do so, from several of the churches being used as land-marks, the word "bell-hoose," or "bell-loose," was substituted. The minister was called "the man wi' the black quyte." A minister in a boat at sea was looked upon with much misgiving. He might be another Jonah. . . .

It was accounted unlucky to utter the word "sow" or "swine" or "pig," particularly during the time when the line was being baited; it was sure to be lost if any one was unwise enough to speak the banned word. In some of the villages on the coast of Fife, if the word is mentioned in the hearing of a fisherman, he cries out "Cold iron." Even in church the same words are uttered when the clergyman reads the miracle about the Gadarene swinery.

The word "hare" also might not be named at sea. In some cases superstition got the better of the greed of gain which commonly makes the Scotch snatch eagerly at any advantage, however petty; for a boat that had been wrecked, and lives lost in it, was allowed to go to pieces on the shore; not a stick of it would have been used, even for firewood, by any inmate of the village; though, if it were sold to some one from another place, the spell of ill luck was broken, and it might be mended and used without danger. We have not space to follow Mr. Gregor into each division of his subject. He has arranged his materials dictionary-wise under their several headings, so as to facilitate the search for information on any subject that comes within the range of his work. His book is a useful contribution to the works of the Folk-Lore Society, as he has thus saved from oblivion many curious customs and superstitions that have now passed out of use and are long would have also passed out of mind.

AMONG THE HILLS.*

IT is by no means an easy task to write a review of a work such as that before us, which, although it professes to be a story, and, in fact, presents itself to us in all the outward semblance of a two-volume novel, is really nothing more than a collection of sketches which, were it not for a certain connexion between them, would be best described as independent studies of character. For story, in the generally accepted sense of the word, there is none. A certain number of incidents are recorded which are, however, altogether subordinated to the development of the characters with whom they are connected, and are often left more or less incomplete. We are more than once led on to expect something in the nature of a *dénouement*, or something which shall serve as a key to some combination of circumstances that may develop into a story; but we are speedily undeceived and brought back to the contemplation of one or another of the characters with which the writer has, not without considerable pains, endeavoured to make us acquainted. In order, therefore, to accomplish anything like a review of the book, it becomes necessary to deal with each of these characters as a distinct and separate creation, and to dismiss from our mind any idea of story, plot, or "situation."

We are told in the opening pages that the heroine of the so-

* *Among the Hills*. By E. Frances Poynter, Author of "My Little Lady," &c. 2 vols. London: Hurst & Blackett.

called story is one Hester or Hetty Adams, the orphan niece of Mrs. Adams, the dressmaker of the little village of Haystead. She is introduced to us in a somewhat apologetic manner as neither beautiful, intellectual, nor saint-like; and further acquaintance with her has certainly the effect of confirming the accuracy of this description. She is, in fact, afflicted by the physical deformity of a hump-back, and by general bad health; and her mind, as sagaciously observed by Mrs. Adams, is as crooked as her body. There certainly does not appear to be the making of a heroine about Hetty Adams, and had we not been otherwise informed, we should have been inclined to select for that distinction her cousin Jenny Adams, Mrs. Adams's own daughter. It may perhaps be convenient to explain at once that there are four principal characters in this village idyl, represented by Hetty and Jenny Adams on the one hand, and by David Griffiths, the village schoolmaster, and Richard Armstrong, a somewhat idealized watchmaker, on the other, the latter of whom, as Hetty is to be considered the heroine, must certainly be regarded as the hero of the drama. The other characters, one of whom, Reuben Frost, seems an attempt at a copy of Mr. Collins in *Pride and Prejudice*, are merely accessories, and require but little notice.

The story then, for such we must call it for the purposes of a review, opens with an introduction to the interior of Mrs. Adams's house, during the month of July. Mrs. Adams herself is a kind-hearted, matronly sort of person, with a tendency towards the enunciation of homely domestic platitudes, and a common-sense view of life which is often sorely tried by her niece Hetty's crooked disposition and unaccountable habits. Of Hetty herself we have said enough for the present, and it is a relief to turn to the contemplation of her cousin Jenny, a bright, good-looking, and lovable country girl, with a sweetness of disposition tempered only by an exaggerated development of her mother's common sense, which induces her to take a somewhat hard and fast view of life and its obligations that is not usually found in a young woman of her age. But there is a freshness and simplicity about her that quite compensate for any little severities of character; and she is, in fact, a very charming delineation of a modest village beauty. Of the two principal male characters, Richard Armstrong, the watchmaker, is a young man of twenty-five, and David Griffiths, the schoolmaster, a middle-aged man of forty-five or thereabouts. Armstrong lives in a cottage with his little niece Nessie, who is also more or less of a cripple; and Griffiths resides at the school-house with his sister, a sort of feminine edition of himself. Armstrong, it is hardly necessary to say, is soon discovered to be in love with Jenny, who in her modest and unaffected way is quite disposed to reciprocate his affection. Hetty, we are sorry to say, is without an admirer, though this was perhaps only to be expected. But her life, unenviable as it seems, is not without certain peculiar elements of interest; and her mind, crabbed and distorted by ill-health and brooding over her bodily infirmities, has sought refuge in a miserly accumulation of money, earned principally by fancy embroidery, executed late at night in the solitude of her own room, for which she finds a ready sale at the hands of a rich old lady in the neighbourhood, who is always ready to give her orders and pay her handsomely for her work. This money of Hetty's becomes, in fact, the turning-point of her life. She all of a sudden falls in love with Armstrong, having been touched and softened by some kind words addressed to her by him at a time when she felt she did not deserve them, having been found by him in the act of bullying poor little Nessie, the sight of whom, reminding her as it does of her own infirmities, has always hitherto engendered in her a feeling of anger and detestation. Now, however, she forces herself to be kind to Nessie for Armstrong's sake, and the two become great friends. Hetty lays herself out in every way to please and attract Armstrong, and soon succeeds in persuading herself that she has done so. Armstrong, who appears to be very fond of talking about himself, is to a certain extent attracted by her quickness and readiness of comprehension, but, of course, has not the remotest idea of making love to her. In the meantime, however, his real love affair with Jenny somehow hangs fire, causing a certain amount of gentle discomposure to that exemplary maiden, who moreover is not slow to notice the dead set made by her cousin at Armstrong. And the latter having said something to Hetty which is misconstrued by her vivid imagination into a direct confession of love, she is for a short time in the seventh heaven of happiness, and considers herself in the light of Armstrong's affianced bride. It has, in fact, been hinted to the reader that there is one slight obstacle to Armstrong's free action in love matters in the shape of an already existing wife, who has behaved badly and is living apart from him; and she presently appears upon the scene in person. But with an amount of consideration for her husband's interest that must be held to atone for much previous misconduct, she arrives at his house one night in a dying state, and before morning Armstrong is a free man. The circumstances of their married life have not been such as to call for any great display of emotion or regret on Armstrong's part; and he soon takes an opportunity of declaring his love for Jenny, in a manner, however, which we cannot but consider as somewhat pedantic and disappointing. By a combination of circumstances which, although carefully explained, we can hardly accept as possible in a little country village where every event of the slightest importance is known and discussed almost before it has happened, the fact of Armstrong being married and of his wife having returned to his house to die has not come under Hetty's cognizance; and almost at one and the same time she hears the news of this episode and of his pro-

posal to Jenny. She does not at first, however, display the emotion that such startling announcements might be expected to produce; and things go on much as usual for a few days. But the arrangements for the marriage of Armstrong and Jenny are retarded by the necessity of sending Nessie away to a certain watering-place recommended by a doctor as likely to restore the use of her limbs. This requires money, which Armstrong has not at present got; and everything appears likely to come to a standstill on this account, when Hetty, hearing the state of the case, resolves in a sudden inspiration of generous feeling to sacrifice her cherished savings for Nessie's benefit. So she carries the money off to Armstrong's house one evening, and with a few broken words of explanation, which, however, are sufficient to give him some idea of her feelings towards himself, places it at his disposal. He is completely taken aback; and, though of course most grateful to her, firmly refuses to accept it. He is at this moment called away on business, and Hetty hurries off, leaving the money behind her. But she has hardly reached home again before a reaction sets in. She begins to realize that she has lost her love, and given up her gold, and has nothing left in the world. The thought is maddening; and she determines to try and get her money back again. She knows that Armstrong is not at home, and she steals back to his house with the idea of recovering her beloved treasure. She finds the house empty, and the bag of sovereigns just where she had left it. But at this moment Armstrong returns, and she feels that she is detected. What happens to her afterwards readers may be allowed to discover for themselves.

It will be seen from the above outline that, as we have already intimated, *Among the Hills* is not by any means a story of thrilling interest. The writer has, in fact, sacrificed everything to the development of the leading characters, and in this respect the reader is bound to experience a certain sense of disappointment. Even when our interest begins to be awakened by something approaching a "situation," it soon fades away, and we find that a good opportunity is wasted in order either to make way for the display of some fresh idiosyncrasy on the part of the heroine, or to enable one or another of the male characters to indulge in some fresh dissertation on things in general. Even the final love scene between Jenny and Armstrong, where the way is cleverly enough prepared for what might be a pretty and effective picture, is rendered tame and uninteresting by the tiresome propensity of the swain to wander off into his eternal lucubrations about himself, his views, and prospects; and the whole thing becomes flat and spiritless. We are disposed to regret this all the more that the book displays throughout some descriptive power; and it might have been just as easy for the writer to have thrown some real interest into the story as to make it what it is, a mere medley of characters. Nor are these very characters by any means absolutely perfect; and they themselves suffer as much from being overdone as the story suffers from their undue prominence. Jenny Adams presents, as we have said, a pretty and charming study; and we feel sure that we have before us a picture drawn faithfully from real life. About Hetty we are not quite so certain. But in her anxiety to make her into a heroine the writer has gone too much into details, the result of which is that we are apt to get somewhat wearied of Hetty and her eccentricities; and the character would, we think, have been far more forcible if less elaborately worked up. On the whole, however, it is a clever sketch; and in criticizing it we are bound to take into consideration the difficulty of dealing successfully with a somewhat uninviting subject. We cannot consider the male characters equally successful. That of Armstrong appears to us unnatural, if not altogether inconsistent with his position in life, although we are told that he has received a good education, where and how is not recorded. His dialogues with David Griffiths are in fact more suggestive of the discussions one might expect to hear between a smart young undergraduate with a tendency to advanced ideas and a learned college don than of conversation between a well-educated mechanic and a village schoolmaster. As regards the schoolmaster, we should not wish to speak so decidedly, for he is evidently a man who has seen much of life; and he describes himself as having passed through phases that may be allowed to have had the effect of raising him to the intellectual position in which he is presented to us. As, however, we never quite get at the whole of his history, we can only sum him up as an interesting but somewhat unfinished character, and there leave him. As a story, *Among the Hills* can hardly be pronounced a success; but as a study of quiet village life, interspersed with decidedly good descriptive passages, it certainly deserves some praise.

AMERICAN LITERATURE.

MAJOR-GENERAL THOMAS (1) was one of the few Southern officers of the United States army who adhered to the Federal side in the great struggle between North and South. Thoroughly master of his profession, unflinching in his devotion to the cause he had deemed it his duty to embrace, his services in the war were of the greatest value and ultimately obtained the fullest recognition. He died in the summer of 1870, and now, in default of an abler biographer, Brigadier-General Johnson, who served under and with him thirteen years, pub-

(1) *Memoir of Major-General George H. Thomas*. By Richard W. Johnson, Brigadier-General U.S.A. Philadelphia: Lippincott & Co. London: Sampson Low & Co. 1881.

lishes this memoir, which is practically, so simple and uneventful was the remainder of the career of General Thomas, little more than a history of his campaigns in the Federal service, swollen by a mass of letters and speeches in which his contemporaries expressed, after his death, their opinion of his merits. Major-General Thomas was born in Southampton, County Virginia, on the 31st July, 1816. He went to West Point in 1836, and after completing his studies received in 1840 a commission as second lieutenant in the 3rd Regiment of Artillery. He distinguished himself in the war against the Floridan Indians and in the Mexican war, and was sent to West Point in 1851, being then Captain Thomas, as "Instructor in Artillery and Cavalry." In 1855 he was appointed Major of the 2nd Regiment of Cavalry, a regiment just organized under a recent Act of Congress, and here the more interesting portion of his career commences. The Colonel of the regiment was Sydney Albert Johnstone, and the Lieutenant-Colonel, Robert E. Lee. Of this period in his hero's career Brigadier Johnson tells us too little. There must surely be letters extant which would show what were the relations between Thomas and his superiors during the five years they were together, and it would be exceedingly interesting to know what the eminent men who were so soon to take divided courses thought and said at the commencement of the conflict. All we are told is that Lee, who was then Colonel of the regiment, General Johnstone being in command of California, was summoned from Texas, where the regiment was then stationed, to Washington in February 1861, by General Scott, Thomas being at that time on leave of absence. What remained of the regiment, Texas having joined the seceding States, reached New York in April 1861; Thomas was appointed on the 3rd of May Colonel, and in the course of the month joined General Patterson at Chambersburg, in Pennsylvania. Henceforward the story of General Thomas's life is a chapter in the history of the great war, which Brigadier Johnson tells at great length, with the aid of Thomas's official reports, but upon which we cannot follow him here. The conduct of General Thomas as a military commander is a question for soldiers by profession. There is, however, one incident—the crowning achievement of his career—which possesses general interest. Brigadier Johnson prints the telegraphic despatches in which Secretary Stanton and General Grant complain of what they call General Thomas's inaction and excessive caution in not attacking Hood at Nashville. The reply of General Thomas to these complaints and threats is a remarkable testimony to his ability and to the firmness of his character. Menaced with dismissal—twice at the instance of Grant, always careless about human life, and thinking only of his own particular operations, orders superseding him had been issued—he replied frankly that he was quite willing to resign his command, but that he could not attack until he was better prepared. Grant, finding out what sort of a man he had to deal with, gave up the idea of superseding him, and resolved to go himself to Nashville. Before, however, he started, he received intelligence of the crushing and complete victory Thomas had won. In a characteristic letter expressing his regret at being unable to assist at the unveiling of the statue of Thomas at Washington, General McClellan speaks of the "magnificent self-possession" with which General Thomas "disregarded the attempts of men ignorant of the circumstances or incapable of appreciating them to force him to give battle prematurely." Major-General Thomas was thanked by Congress for his services, and at the close of the war was appointed to the civil and military command of the States of Kentucky, Tennessee, Georgia, Alabama, and Mississippi. He seems to have discharged his difficult functions very successfully; but he was greatly annoyed, his biographer tells us, by attempts made to bring him forward as a candidate for the Presidency of the United States. General Johnson records a conversation with him, which is so characteristic of the man that it is worth quoting:—"I will have nothing to do with politics. I am a soldier, and I know my duty; as a politician I would be lost. No, sir; not even if I were elected unanimously would I accept. I want to die with a fair record, and this I will do if I keep out of the sea of politics and cling to my proper profession." The modesty and good sense of General Thomas were further shown in his refusal to accept the command of the army which President Johnson, who had had some misunderstanding with Grant, desired to confer upon him. Major-General Thomas died at San Francisco, where he was stationed in command of the Military Division of the Pacific, in May 1870. His death was sudden and premature, for his age was only fifty-three; but he died with the "fair record" to which he aspired.

Major Jones, who is United States Consul at Newcastle-upon-Tyne, prefaces his recollections of the army of the Potomac (2) with a "brief record" of the political struggle which ended in the election of Abraham Lincoln as President of the United States; a struggle in which, although he had not attained "the required age of citizenship," the author took, he tells us, an active part. Other chapters on slavery and emancipation, war and credit, serve the same purpose of needlessly increasing the size of a book which, so far as it gives us Major Jones's recollections of his life in the army, is lively and readable, and the general tone and temper of which are creditable to the writer. *The Emigrant's Friend* (3), of which Major Jones is also the author,

is intended as a guide to those persons who propose seeking their fortunes in the United States, and they cannot do better than attend to its hints. Major Jones warns the would-be emigrant not to leave the mother-country without fully and anxiously considering the subject in every aspect. He bids him "look at the dark side of the picture—the broad Atlantic, the dusty ride to the Great West, the scorching sun, the cold winter—coldest you ever experienced—and the hard work." "You may take my word for it," he says, "they work harder in the new than in the old country." But if people are bent on emigrating, Major Jones supplies them with valuable information in the shape of a description of each State and Territory, showing how far each is suitable for the emigrant in the matter of cheapness of land, climate, &c., and in useful directions as to the voyage, the journey from the seaboard to the West, and the commencement of his new career.

The promise of Captain Wilhelm's handsome volume (4) is, we are sorry to say, not kept. The reason is very simple. *Qui trop embrasse mal étreint*. Captain Wilhelm undertakes a great deal too much. He not only offers the "student of the science and art of war, persons interested in the local or reserve forces, libraries, as well as the editors of the daily press," *A Military Dictionary and Gazetteer*, which must in itself be a work of great magnitude to be of any use; but he further supplies them "with historical accounts of all North American Indians, as well as ancient warlike tribes, and a concise explanation of terms used in heraldry and the offices thereof." The natural result is that the book is very imperfect. The information given is in the main correct enough, but the information which those persons for whose benefit the book is designed are most likely to need is too frequently wanting.

The *Annual Report of the Chief of Engineers, United States Army* (5) is in every respect but its portentous length a pattern of what official publications should be. Only two hundred and fifty of the two thousand six hundred pages which are contained in its three volumes are, however, occupied with the Engineer's Report. The remaining pages contain the *pieces justificatives* in the shape of maps and reports from the Engineer's subordinates. The burden of the Report is the lamentable inefficiency of the Seacoast and Lake frontier defences of the United States.

The *Young Nimrods* (6) is an unpretending book in which the publishers have utilised a number of illustrations which had already done service in some of their other publications. The text appears, indeed, to have been written up to the cuts, some of which have really nothing to do with the subject of the book, although Mr. Knox has, with a courage which does him credit, worked them all in. Boys of the old as well as of the new world will find the book very interesting.

A *Handbook of Nursing* (7) is an admirable manual for the use of professional nurses. The directions are singularly clear and full. They appear, so far as laymen may presume to judge, to comprise every case of difficulty which can present itself to a nurse; and the fact that they are published under the direction of the Connecticut Training School for Nurses may be taken as evidence that they come up to the present standard of what we may venture to call the science of nursing. We must demur, however, to the designation of the book as for family and general use. The minute descriptions of the duties of the midwife and of the nurse who attends cases of lithotomy or ovariectomy, useful as they must be for the professional nurse, disqualify the book for family and general use.

The *Easiest Way in Housekeeping and Cooking* (8) is the most disagreeable contribution to what for many is a fascinating class of literature that we have ever met with. Mrs. Campbell occupies a considerable portion of her little book with a pretentious description of the process of digestion, and an unnecessarily full account of the various operations which go on in that great laboratory, the stomach. The information she supplies on these points will not assist any housekeeper to select provisions or cook them properly, and we feel the deepest sympathy for the American householder, if such a man there be, whose wife studies Mrs. Campbell's precepts and endeavours to apply them.

We have received the second volume of the *Index-Catalogue of the Library of the Surgeon-General's Office, United States Army* (9). It contains nearly a thousand pages, embracing authors and subjects from Berlioz to Cholas. The general arrangement is excellent, and, what is a matter of great importance to students of medicine, the *Index-Catalogue* is not confined to books, but gives the subjects of the more important papers published in the medical periodicals of all countries, and the names of the contributors. We have also received No. 10 of *Bibliographical Contributions to the Library of Harvard University*, entitled *Hallivelliana: a Bibliography of the*

(4) *A Military Dictionary and Gazetteer*. By Thomas Wilhelm, Captain Eighth Infantry. Philadelphia: Hamersley & Co. London: Trübner & Co. 1881.

(5) *Annual Report of the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, for the year 1880*. In Three Parts. Washington: Government Printing Office. London: Trübner & Co. 1880.

(6) *The Young Nimrods in North America: a Book for Boys*. By Thomas W. Knox. New York: Harper & Brothers. London: Sampson Low & Co. 1881.

(7) *A Handbook of Nursing for Family and General Use*. Philadelphia: Lippincott & Co. London: Trübner & Co. 1881.

(8) *The Easiest Way in Housekeeping and Cooking*. By Helen Campbell. New York: Fords, Howard, & Hulbert. London: Trübner & Co. 1881.

(9) *Index-Catalogue of the Library of the Surgeon-General's Office, United States Army—Authors and Subjects*. Vol. II. Berlioz—Cholas. Washington: Government Printing-Office. London: Trübner & Co. 1881.

(2) *Four Years in the Army of the Potomac: a Soldier's Recollections*. By Major Jones. London: The Tyne Publishing Company.

(3) *The Emigrant's Friend*. By Major Jones, United States Consul, Newcastle-upon-Tyne. London: The Tyne Publishing Company.

Publications of James Orchard Halliwell-Phillips (10). This little brochure, which is reprinted from the *Bulletin* of Harvard University, will possess considerable interest for all students of Shakespeare.

Friends (11) is worth the little time required to read it, and will deeply interest many who do read it. *The Georgians* (12) shows some promise. The author succeeds in the description of Southern life, but fails in telling his story. *A Gentleman of Leisure* (13) recounts the adventures of an American who, brought up in England and saturated with all the prejudices against his native land which, it appears, prevail in English aristocratic circles, visited New York upon business, was introduced into the best society of the Empire city, fell in love, and finally determined to enter Congress.

We have also received *A Book of Love Stories* (14), by Norah Perry, and *My College Days* (15), by Robert Tomes, an old man's recollections of Hartford and of Edinburgh, where he began his studies in 1836.

Longfellow's *Leaflets* (16) are selections from his prose and poetical works, prefaced by a short memoir and copiously illustrated.

The Hawaiian Almanac and Annual (17) contains much statistical and other information which will be useful to all persons interested in the islands over which King Kalakaua rules.

We have received translations of two works which, so far as we are aware, have not before made their appearance in an English dress. Mr. Charles S. Sargent, Professor of Arboriculture in Harvard College, has, at the instance of the Massachusetts Society for the Promotion of Agriculture, translated from the French *A Treatise on Pruning Forest and Ornamental Trees*, by A. Des Cars (18). Mr. Sargent, who strongly recommends the method advocated by his author, suggests in his introduction that the time is close at hand when his countrymen will find it profitable to plant and rear new forests according to scientific principles.

Synnöve Solbakken (19) is the first volume of what is apparently intended to be a complete edition of the works of the famous Norwegian poet and novelist, Bjørnstjerne Bjørnson. The general accuracy of the version may be taken to be guaranteed by the co-operation of Mr. Bjørnson with the translator, Professor Erasmus B. Anderson.

Among the periodical publications which have reached us is the August number of *Harper's Magazine* (20), the most generally interesting paper in which is an account, very copiously illustrated, of the surrender of Lord Cornwallis at Yorktown, in October 1781. The centenary of this very important incident in the war is to be celebrated with much ceremony. We have also received *The Penn Monthly*, for July (21), which may be recommended for a remarkable paper on the "Need of a broader political education," by the Hon. Dorman B. Eaton; *The American Art Review* (22), which maintains its high standard of excellence; and No. 6 of *The Southern Historical Society Papers* (23) for the current year, a publication to the value and interest of which we have already drawn attention.

(10) *Library of Harvard University.—Bibliographical Contributions.* No. 10. *Hallucinations: a Bibliography of the Publications of James Orchard Halliwell-Phillips.* By Justin Winsor. Cambridge, Mass.: University Press, 1881.

(11) *Friends: a Dust.* By Elizabeth Stuart Phelps. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin, & Co. London: Trübner & Co. 1881.

(12) *Round-Robin Series.—The Georgians.* Boston: Osgood & Co. London: Trübner & Co. 1881.

(13) *A Gentleman of Leisure.* By Edgar Fawcett. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin, & Co. London: Trübner & Co. 1881.

(14) *A Book of Love Stories.* By Norah Perry. Boston: Osgood & Co. London: Trübner & Co. 1881.

(15) *My College Days.* By Robert Tomes. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1880.

(16) *Leaflets from Standard Authors.—Poems and Prose Passages from the Works of Henry Wadsworth Longfellow.* Compiled by Josephine E. Hodgdon. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin, & Co. London: Trübner & Co. 1881.

(17) *Hawaiian Almanac and Annual for 1881.* Honolulu: Thomas G. Thrum. London: Trübner & Co.

(18) *A Treatise on Pruning Forest and Ornamental Trees.* By A. Des Cars. Translated from the Seventh French Edition, by Charles S. Sargent. Boston: Williams & Co. London: Trübner & Co. 1881.

(19) *Synnöve Solbakken.* By Bjørnstjerne Bjørnson. Translated from the Norse. By Erasmus B. Anderson. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin, & Co. London: Trübner & Co. 1881.

(20) *Harper's Magazine.* London: Sampson Low & Co.

(21) *The Penn Monthly.* For July. Philadelphia: Stern & Co. London: Sampson Low & Co.

(22) *The American Art Review.* London: Sampson Low & Co.

(23) *The Southern Historical Society Papers.* Richmond, Va.: Secretariat Southern Historical Society.

We are informed that the Author of "Practical Ceramics for Students," reviewed in the SATURDAY REVIEW, July 2, 1881, is not Charles A. Janvier, but CATHERINE A. JANVIER, the mistake being due to the English publishers.

NOTICE.

We beg leave to state that we decline to return rejected Communications; and to this rule we can make no exception.

THE SATURDAY REVIEW

OF

POLITICS, LITERATURE, SCIENCE, AND ART.

Price 6d.

CONTENTS OF No. 1,348, AUGUST 27, 1881:

The French Commercial Treaty.
The Indian Budget. Election Affairs.
The Pope at Malta. The French Elections. Prisons and Colleges.
Reform in Victoria. First Fruits of the Land Bill.
Egypt. Decoying.
The Session. A Lesson in Humour.
Turtles and Insects. Pocomantism. Autumn in the Highlands.
Yacht-Racing. The Drain of Gold. The Theatres.
Brewer's English Studies.
Ionian Antiquities. Lieutenant Barnabas.
Jarrar's Mercy and Judgment. Nos Auteurs Dramatiques. Canoncity.
Colonel Playfair's Mediterranean. Folk-Lore of Scotland.
Among the Hills. American Literature.

London: Published at 88 SOUTHAMPTON STREET, STRAND, W.C.

ADVERTISEMENTS.

DORÉ'S GREAT WORKS, "CHRIST LEAVING the PRATOBURUM," "CHRIST ENTERING JERUSALEM," and "MOSES BEFORE PHARAOH," each 33 by 23 feet, with "Dream of Pilate's Wife," "Christian Martyrs," &c. at the DORÉ GALLERY, 35 New Bond Street. Daily, Ten to Six. 1s.

ST. BARTHOLOMEW'S HOSPITAL and COLLEGE.

OPEN SCHOLARSHIPS IN SCIENCE.
TWO SCHOLARSHIPS of the value of £130 each, tenable for one year, will be competed for on September 28th, and the three succeeding days. One of the value of £130 will be awarded to the best candidate at this Examination, under twenty years of age, if of sufficient merit. For the other, candidates must be under 25 years of age.
The subjects for Examination are Physics, Chemistry, Botany, and Zoology.
The Jefferson Exhibition will be competed for at the same time. The subjects of examination are Latin, Mathematics, and any two of the three following languages, Greek, French, German.
This is an Open Exhibition of the value of £20.
Candidates must not have entered to the Medical or Surgical Practice of any Metropolitan Medical School.
The successful candidates will be required to enter at St. Bartholomew's Hospital in the October succeeding the examination.
For particulars application may be made to the WARDEN of the College, St. Bartholomew's Hospital, E.C.

ST. GEORGE'S HOSPITAL MEDICAL SCHOOL, Hyde Park Corner, W.

THE WINTER SESSION will commence on Monday, October 3, with an INTRODUCTORY ADDRESS by Mr. J. WARRINGTON HAWARD, at 4 P.M.
The William Brown £100 and £40 Exhibitions are open to all Perpetual Students.
The Two Brackenbury Prizes of £50 each, Sir Charles Clarke's Prize, the Thompson Medal, the Treasurer's, Brodie, Acland, Johnson, and General Proficiency Prizes, are open to all Students.
The appointments of House Physician and House Surgeon, of which there are four, tenable each for one year, are awarded by competition, and no charge is made by the Governors of the Hospital for Board or Residence.
Clerkships and Dresserships, and all the minor appointments, are given without extra fees.
A Prospectus of the School, and further information, may be obtained by personal application between One and Three P.M., or by letter addressed to the DEAN at the Hospital.

THE LONDON HOSPITAL and MEDICAL COLLEGE.

Mid-end, E.—THE SESSION 1881-82 will Commence on Saturday, October 1, 1881. FOUR ENTRANCE SCHOLARSHIPS, value £60, £40, £30, and £20, will be offered for competition at the end of September to new Students. Entries on or before September 20. Fees for Lectures and Hospital Practice, 50 Guineas in one payment, or 100 Guineas in three instalments. All Resident and other Hospital Appointments are free. The Resident Appointments consist of Five House-Physicians, Four House-Surgeons, and One Apothecary; Two Dressers and Two Maternity Pupils also reside in the Hospital. Special entries may be made for Medical and Surgical practice. The London Hospital is now in direct communication by rail and tram with all parts of the Metropolis.

MUNRO SCOTT, Warden.

ROYAL AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE, Cirencester.

For the Science and Practice of Agriculture.
For Intending Land Owners and Occupiers, Land Agents, Surveyors, Colonists, &c.
The R.A.C. Farm, surrounding the College, is a well-farmed farm of about 500 Acres.
Chairman of Committee of Management.—The Right Hon. the Earl of DUCIE.
For Prospectus of College and Farm, List of Scholarships, Prizes, Diplomas, &c., apply to the PRINCIPAL.

THE GUILDHALL SCHOOL of MUSIC, under the conduct and control of the Corporation of London.

Principal—Mr. H. WEIST HILL.
THE FIRST TERM of the SESSION 1881-2 will commence on Monday, September 19, 1881. EXAMINATIONS of CANDIDATES for ADMISSION as STUDENTS will be held on Saturday, September 18, and Monday, September 19, from Twelve till Four, when Candidates must attend, bringing with them music they can perform.
For further particulars apply at the School, 16 Aldermanbury, E.C.

Guildhall, August 1881. FRED. A. CATTY, Hon. Secretary.
CHARLES F. SMITH, Secretary.

CRYSTAL PALACE SCHOOL of LANDSCAPE GARDENING. Principal—Mr. EDWARD MILNER.

The NEXT TERM will commence on Saturday, October 1. Prospectus in the Office of the Crystal Palace Company's School of Art, Science, and Literature, in the Library, next Byzantine Court, Crystal Palace.

F. K. J. SHENTON, Superintendent Literary Department.

COLLEGE of PRACTICAL ENGINEERING, MUSWELL HILL, London.

Under eminent technical auspices.—For terms and particulars write to the PRINCIPAL.

ISLE of WIGHT PROPRIETARY COLLEGE, APLEY (near RYDE).

THE WINTER TERM will commence on Friday, September 16.
Full particulars from the Rev. Canon TEESDALE, Head-Master; or the SECRETARY, The Cottage, Melville Street, Ryde.

DOVER COLLEGE.

THE NEXT TERM will commence on September 14. Board, £40; house rent, 6 Guineas. Tuition from 13 to 18 Guineas.—Apply to the Rev. W. BELL, M.A., Head-Master, or WOLLASTON KNOCKER, Esq., Honorary Secretary.

MALVERN COLLEGE.

THE NEXT TERM commences Tuesday, September 27.
EXAMINATIONS for SCHOLARSHIPS, December 23 and 24.
For information, apply to HENRY ALDRICH, Esq., Secretary.

S. ANDREW'S COLLEGE, CHARDSTOCK, Dorset.

RE-OPENS September 16. Preparation for Universities and Public Schools. Moderate and inclusive fees.—Apply to SECRETARY.

WORTHING COLLEGE, SUSSEX.

Principal—Mr. W. E. LLOYD TREVOR.

Vice-Principal—Mr. FREDERIC LOWE, B.A., Graduate in Honours, St. John's College, Cambridge.
BOYS prepared for Public Schools, the Universities, the Civil and Military Examinations. List of recent successes and Prospects forwarded on application. THE THIRD TERM will commence on Tuesday, September 19.